

Marine Firemen's Union, and Shovelers' Union No. 110, all of Buffalo, N. Y., favoring the construction of naval vessels at the Government navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, resolution of Lake Seamen's Union of Buffalo, N. Y., in opposition to the change of name of the United States Marine-Hospital Service—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SHERMAN: Resolutions of Cigar Makers' Union No. 7, of Utica, N. Y., favoring the reenactment of Chinese-exclusion act—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Elkhart Chapter, Division 248, and Indianapolis Division No. 11, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, favoring bill to limit the power of Federal courts in granting injunctions in trade disputes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolutions of Cement Workers' Union No. 40, and Journeymen Bakers' Union No. 100, of Utica, N. Y., and Iron Molders' Union No. 246, of Frankfort, N. Y., praying for the further restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SHACKLEFORD: Resolutions of Carpenters' Union No. 945, of Jefferson, Mo., relative to the construction of vessels in Government navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SPERRY: Resolutions of Typographical Union No. 47, of New Haven, Conn., in favor of the reenactment of Chinese-exclusion act—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolution of Typographical Union No. 47, of New Haven, Conn., favoring a further restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. STARK: Papers to accompany House bill for the erection of a public building in the city of York, Nebr., consisting of a map of York County, a map of the city of York, a list of business houses in the city of York, manufacturing plants, wholesale houses, professional men, colleges, churches, public utilities, societies and clubs, train service, post-office business, and statement of buildings constructed during the last year, all furnished by the Commercial Club, York, Nebr., and letter of Hon. C. A. McCloud, mayor—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 9653, granting an increase of pension to James L. McGee, of Beatrice, Nebr.; also, papers to accompany House bill 10769, granting an increase of pension to Cyrus Payne—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEELE: Resolution of Carpenters' Union No. 160, of Gas City, Ind., for the passage of laws which will prevent the immigration of persons who can not read—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: Paper to accompany House bill for the relief of the heirs of Jonathan Hawkins—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. VREELAND: Two petitions of citizens of Jamestown, N. Y., favoring the adoption of an antipolygamy amendment to the Constitution—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution of Carpenters' Union No. 546, of Olean, N. Y., for the passage of laws which will prevent the immigration of persons who can not read—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolution of Leather Workers' Union of Olean, N. Y., and Street Railway Employees' Union of Jamestown, N. Y., in favor of the exclusion of Chinese laborers—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WADSWORTH: Resolutions of Typographical Union No. 233, of Niagara Falls, N. Y., favoring a reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion law—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of Typographical Union No. 233, favoring an educational qualification for immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolutions of Power City Lodge, Union No. 316, of Niagara Falls, N. Y., and of Retail Clerks' Union No. 489, of North Tonawanda, N. Y., favoring the building of war vessels in the United States navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WILCOX: Resolutions of the Republican party of Territory of Hawaii, disapproving any attempt to restrict the franchise of the natives of the islands—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois: Resolutions of Rhoads Post, No. 58, of New Haven, Ill., Grand Army of the Republic, favoring the building of war vessels in the navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, paper to accompany House bill 11794, granting an increase of pension to John M. Stevens—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill 11795, for the relief of Martin V. Dial—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WRIGHT: Resolutions of Southern Tier Division, No. 10, Railway Conductors of America, favoring exclusion of undesirable immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolutions of Swarts Post, No. 72, and Lieutenant H. C. Titman Post, No. 93, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Pennsylvania, relative to the construction of vessels in Government navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG: Petition of Lydia B. Paxon and 5 others of Philadelphia, in relation to certain immoralities prevailing in the Philippines—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

## SENATE.

TUESDAY, February 25, 1902.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of yesterday.

Mr. STEWART. I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the Journal be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nevada asks unanimous consent that the further reading of the Journal be dispensed with. Is there objection?

Mr. TURNER and Mr. DUBOIS. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is made, and the reading will proceed.

The Secretary resumed and concluded the reading of the Journal, and it was approved.

### DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE CRUMP.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the resolutions from the House of Representatives in relation to the death of Hon. ROUSSEAU O. CRUMP, my late colleague in that body.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate resolutions of the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolutions of the House of Representatives, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, February 21, 1902.

Resolved, That the House of Representatives has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. ROUSSEAU O. CRUMP, late a Representative from the State of Michigan.

Resolved, That as a mark of respect to his memory the House do now adjourn.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. President, I offer the resolutions which I send to the desk, and ask unanimous consent for their immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolutions will be read.

The Secretary read the resolutions, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with deep sensibility the announcement of the death of Hon. ROUSSEAU O. CRUMP, late a Representative from the State of Michigan.

Resolved, That as an additional mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now adjourn.

The resolutions were unanimously agreed to; and, under the second resolution, the Senate (at 12 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, February 26, 1902, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, February 25, 1902.

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

### PROPERTY TAKEN BY UNITED STATES FORCES.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask leave that House bill 2659, being a bill for the relief of parties for property taken from them by military forces of the United States, lie on the table, a similar bill from the Senate having been passed by the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks that House bill 2659 lie on the table, a similar bill from the Senate having been passed by the House. This order will be made, if there be no objection.

There was no objection.

### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows: To Mr. BREAZEALE, indefinitely, on account of sickness in family.

To Mr. VANDIVER, indefinitely, on account of important business.

To Mr. BOWERSOCK, for one week, on account of important business.

### DIPLOMATIC APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HITT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of appropriation bills, especially the one I shall call the consular and diplomatic appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the



state of the Union for the further consideration of consular and diplomatic appropriation bill.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. CURTIS in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of further considering the diplomatic appropriation bill, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 11471) making appropriations for the diplomatic and consular service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903.

Mr. HITT. Mr. Chairman, at the time the committee rose the bill was being considered in general debate, and in resuming that general debate I will ask the Chair to recognize the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS] for thirty minutes.

Mr. ADAMS. Will the gentleman yield one moment?

Mr. SIMS. Certainly.

Mr. ADAMS. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks of yesterday in the RECORD.

There being no objection, it was so ordered.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, I hope the House will bear with me if I repeat just a little of what was said yesterday afternoon, as I was requested to yield the floor in order that the House might adjourn and pay its respects to a very distinguished citizen of a great country who was visiting our capital, Prince Henry of Prussia, and I yielded for that purpose. Now I want to say that I do not intend and it is not my purpose to say anything that will wound the feelings of any member of this House. I am serious about the remarks that I expect to make, and in some respects critical, but critical of a policy and not of the acts of individuals. This is a serious matter, when we consider the great amount that this Government has to pay year in and year out on account of pensions. I think the subject certainly worthy of reasonable and patient consideration. It is well known that on the days devoted by the rules of the House to the consideration of private pension bills we can not have time to discuss these matters in general.

I know that it is barely possible to consider a reasonable number of bills in proportion to the number on the Calendar for consideration, and that is my excuse for imposing upon the patience of the House at this time. Bear with me while I state the facts, which I think justify me in the remarks I am making. I am making no appeal to the galleries, but to this House, because I feel it is my duty to appeal to it, and it is for the House to consider the facts that I shall state. What I shall have to say will have no party politics in it, and is as much directed to this side of the House as to that.

There are some reasons for congratulation, and some of these I shall now state. The appropriation bill for pensions for the fiscal year 1900 was \$145,233,830; for 1901, \$145,245,230; for 1902, \$145,245,230, and for 1903, the bill already passed the House, carries \$139,842,230, or a reduction of \$5,403,000 from 1902. It will take, according to the estimates, \$5,403,000 less money to pay pensions for the ensuing fiscal year than for the last three fiscal years. While that is a fact, I wish to state that it is also true, as appears from the records, that we had on the pension rolls on the 1st of July, 1901, 997,735 pensioners, 4,206 more than the year before. While the total appropriation is \$5,403,000 less, the pension roll has increased, as I have just stated.

That, I think, is something upon which we should congratulate those who manage the Pension Office, and it is a well-deserved congratulation. All just pension claims should be granted, and granted for reasonable amounts, and they should continue to increase if meritorious applications continue to come in. The continuation of military strife means a continuation of causes for pension, legitimate and worthy. Therefore it appears that the pension roll is going to be somewhat of a measure of "the greatest good to the greatest number," if we continue to increase the number of pensioners while we decrease the gross amount paid. I think it is more just to give every worthy person a pension reasonable in amount than to give large numbers excessive pensions and deny many of those justly entitled to reasonable pensions, because the amount to be paid may thus greatly increase year after year.

What I desire to talk about chiefly, and I hope I will have the earnest attention of the House, is the character of private bills that we pass, the number of them, the reasons for them, and what policy, if any, should be adopted by the House to prevent this flood of private bills for our consideration. At the present time, only three months of this session of Congress having passed, 5,672 private pension bills have been introduced and referred to the two Pension Committees. Now, it is reasonable to presume that each member in this House, in introducing a private pension bill, has done so seriously and with the intent to try to procure its passage. I want to know if it is possible for these two committees to give this great flood of bills such attention as they deserve? I happen to know well the chairmen of both these committees.

There are no two men for whom I have a higher regard; there are not, probably, two more honest and sincere in the public service. I want to say that I have had the pleasure as well as the honor of having lived four years in the same hotel with the chairman of the Committee on Invalid Pensions. I believe I know something about the facts, and I think I do not misrepresent them when I say that the chairman and the clerks of his committee work six days in the week; and I do not suppose I would misrepresent were I to say a good deal on Sundays also. It is work, work all the time, and yet what does it amount to? With this great amount of work, the number of bills considered and reported is very small in proportion to the number they are asked to consider.

Why should that be the case? That is one of the things I wish to inquire into and ascertain, if I can, what must be done in order to prevent it. If these 5,672 bills are just measures, they ought to be considered in a reasonable time and action taken on them in this House; but it is utterly impossible. I believe that I do not misstate the facts in saying that some members of this House have introduced as many as 200 private pension bills. Now, in justice to the membership of this House the committees have tried to deal fairly and report about the same number of bills for each member. What does it amount to? Two, three, four, possibly five to the member is all that can be reported, while he has forty or fifty unreported bills. These unreported bills perhaps just as meritorious and worthy of consideration as the meager number that are considered.

What is the consequence? When that member goes home he has on his hands 30, 40, or 50 men for whom he has been unable to get any measure of relief. They raise a fire of complaint behind him because three, four, or five bills have been reported. They have a just right to complain. Why should they be selected out of the number introduced for favorable action, while 40, 50, or perhaps 100 others just as good are not reported?

The member finds that getting a few bills reported and passed has only increased his troubles. The three or four whose pensions have thus been increased are often badly dissatisfied because they did not get as great an increase as they felt they were entitled to, and thus the clamor and the storm grows worse.

How can the committee do more than they are doing? How can they work harder? How can they report a greater number of bills and consider them at all? How can the House do more than it is doing? It is a remarkable spectacle to come into this House on private-bill day and see bill after bill pass without a word of information, simply trusting to the committee. Do not blame the House, do not censure it, because, do as it may, it amounts substantially to a denial of justice to a great number of men no doubt as worthy as those whose bills receive consideration.

Look into it; see the result. I say, Mr. Chairman, that this House ought not to undertake to revise the pension roll. It is not capable of doing it. It has not the necessary information nor has it the time to carry it out. General legislation is loudly called for to prevent this House from perpetrating the grossest favoritism and abuses. Take the pension bills passed in the short session of the last Congress. We had only four days—three whole days and a part of another—for pensions. There were passed 707 bills, an average of 177 at a sitting of the House. No more rapid work could be done to have the dignity of consideration and be entitled to it. Let us see what we did. It certainly presents a case for proper and intelligent treatment. I do not profess to have all the information on this subject. I have but little, and I would be glad if some member of the House more conversant with the matter would give the information we so sadly need.

As I have just said, there were 707 bills passed at the short session in four sittings of the House, an average of 177 on each sitting. The amount appropriated per annum, in round numbers, was \$120,000; that to continue for the life of the pensioners. In that short space, counting five hours to a session—and there were sessions when there were not over four hours—both in Committee of the Whole and in proper session, the House had to pass upon these 177 bills, amounting to about \$30,000 a session, or \$5,000 an hour. The amount involved calls for more deliberate consideration.

Nearly all of these bills were for increases for men who had had consideration at the Pension Bureau and had received a pension for some amount. I want this House to get an idea of the average increase. I will go a little into detail, in order that members may know that I am not overstating the matter. There were 467 bills for increases. Two hundred and sixty-five of that 467 increase the pensions already allowed by the Pension Bureau from 100 to 500 per cent.

The average increase for all is about 200 per cent over and above what the Bureau allowed.

Mr. Chairman, I here read from the last report of the Commissioner of Pensions a statement of the private pension bills passed at the short session of the Fifty-sixth Congress for increases, showing the amount of pension received under the general law



as allowed by the Pension Bureau and the amount given the soldier by private bill by way of increase, and I hope this table may be studied with both interest and profit by this House. The table shows the name of the soldier, his rank, and the pension he now receives by private act, and the amount he received prior to the special private act, as follows:

Name of soldier.	Rank and service.	Monthly rate—	
		By special act.	Prior to special act.
Michael Dempsey	Private	\$12.00	\$8.00
David S. Snyder	Captain	24.00	12.00
Nicholas Briggeman	Corporal	30.00	12.00
Cornwell M. Brill	Private	20.00	12.00
James A. Cabbell	do	24.00	12.00
James U. Childs	Second lieutenant	50.00	12.00
Charles Claussen	Private	20.00	17.00
George S. Colbath	Captain	20.00	8.00
George O. Cole	Private	30.00	12.00
Edwin Culver	Quartermaster-sergeant	50.00	35.00
Oliver Doman	Sergeant	30.00	12.00
Simon B. Dow	Corporal	12.00	8.00
Wilbur F. Dubois	First lieutenant	17.00	12.00
William N. Ferry	do	40.00	12.00
Louis Hebel	Captain	24.00	6.00
Joseph E. Hendrickson	Private	50.00	14.00
John F. Hutchison	do	50.00	12.00
Charles H. Irvin	Captain	30.00	12.00
Matthew T. Jones	Private	30.00	14.00
Samuel W. Kirkendall	do	36.00	12.00
Byron Kurtz	do	30.00	12.00
John H. Morrison	First lieutenant	17.00	6.00
Eli H. Murray	Colonel	30.00	8.00
John Nicklin	First Battery Minnesota Volunteer Light Artillery	24.00	17.00
Maj. A. Northrop	Wagoner	30.00	12.00
Daniel H. O'Linn	Private	17.00	12.00
Edward A. Parmalee	do	30.00	24.00
Ernst Pitschner	Sergeant	20.00	12.00
Alonzo C. Rembaugh	Captain	24.00	12.00
Lewis H. Riden	Private	24.00	12.00
Gideon W. T. Ridlon	do	30.00	12.00
Samuel R. Sharrard	Captain	20.00	8.00
Thomas J. Stillman	First lieutenant	17.00	12.00
John B. Sharpe	Corporal	12.00	8.00
William Stephenson	First lieutenant	15.00	17.00
Rowen Summers	do	17.00	8.00
Moses H. Taber	Private	40.00	25.00
Samuel A. Tate	do	20.00	8.00
Giles W. Taylor	do	30.00	12.00
Charles A. Westfield	do	30.00	24.00
John H. Wilcox	do	50.00	30.00
Martin V. B. Winkler	do	30.00	12.00
Boswell S. Wilmarth	Second lieutenant	15.00	8.00
John J. Wilson	Private	36.00	30.00
Melchior Weinheimer	do	24.00	8.00
Melancthon McCoy	do	50.00	25.00
Nicholas Crottenburg	Second lieutenant	15.00	8.00
Edmund P. Tierney	Hospital steward	30.00	12.00
Edwin S. Anderson	Private	15.00	6.00
Andrew J. Arnett	Corporal	30.00	12.00
Samuel S. Brooks	Second assistant engineer	20.00	8.00
Issac N. Cissna	Corporal	30.00	16.00
James W. Cluke	do	20.00	8.00
Gilbert F. Colby	Private	24.00	12.00
John Coombs	do	40.00	30.00
Brice Davis	Musician	30.00	12.00
William Daniels	Corporal	12.00	8.00
William H. Danilson	Major	25.00	8.00
Jonathan W. Childs	Colonel	30.00	8.00
Lunsford Ellis	Private	20.00	12.00
Jesse F. Gates	do	30.00	17.00
William T. Gratton	do	30.00	8.00
George B. Hayden	Sergeant	24.00	12.00
Thomas G. Huff	Private	50.00	12.00
George W. Harrison	Captain and assistant quartermaster	20.00	8.00
Alfred Hering	Private	20.00	8.00
James Irvine	Sergeant	20.00	12.00
Stephen Johnson	Private	17.00	8.00
Elam Kirk	Chaplain	30.00	12.00
Stephen Longfellow	Sergeant	30.00	24.00
William R. McMaster	Private	40.00	30.00
David H. Morey	do	40.00	12.00
Anthony Muck	Captain	20.00	8.00
Samuel Nichols	Private	20.00	8.00
William Oliver	Corporal	24.00	12.00
James Osborn	Private	25.00	17.00
Charles A. Perkins	Landman	30.00	12.00
Jasper Pitts	Private	30.00	12.00
Francis M. Porter	Commissary sergeant	50.00	12.00
Eben E. Pushor	Corporal	20.00	10.00
Alexander Repetti	Lieutenant-colonel	25.00	8.00
Benjamin Rippleman	Private	17.00	10.00
Albert A. Roberts	do	12.00	8.00
John Roop	First assistant engineer	20.00	12.00
Joseph Smith	Private	17.00	6.00
Samuel Schutz	do	24.00	12.00
Cornelius Shroder	do	20.00	12.00
Sylvester Solomon	do	25.00	12.00
Henry Van Gelder	Corporal	30.00	12.00
Adam Velten	Private and sergeant	40.00	12.00
Thomas Claiborne	First lieutenant	12.00	8.00
James Coventon	Musician	16.00	12.00
Alfred W. Drew	First lieutenant	25.00	17.00
Bogardus Eldridge	Captain	30.00	20.00
W. G. Lyster	Colonel	35.00	25.00
Abram R. Smith	Private	\$16.00	\$8.00
Edward Wm. Sturdy	Lieutenant-commander	35.00	30.00
Melville C. Wilkinson	Captain	30.00	20.00
John A. Wilcox	Lieutenant-colonel	12.00	8.00
Charles A. D. Wiswell	Private	36.00	12.00
Frederick W. Baker	Captain	20.00	12.00
George W. Carr	Second lieutenant	12.00	8.00
Eli F. Chittenden	Corporal	50.00	17.00
Elsy Frisbey	Musician	12.00	8.00
William E. Ferree	Private	20.00	8.00
John Hutchens	do	12.00	8.00
Thomas J. Jackson	Lieutenant-colonel	50.00	30.00
Ellis P. Phipps	Second and first lieutenant	60.00	50.00
Alvin N. Sabin	First lieutenant	50.00	13.00
Thomas L. Turnipseed	Private	12.00	8.00
John L. Young	do	12.00	8.00
John Abell	do	24.00	12.00
Luke P. Allphin	First sergeant	12.00	8.00
Julian G. Baker	Quartermaster	20.00	10.00
Henry C. Brooks	Private	30.00	12.00
Frank Blair	do	16.00	12.00
James Beistle	do	17.00	8.00
Adam Beiger	do	24.00	12.00
Francis Buehler	do	20.00	17.00
Walter Mason Dickinson	Captain	30.00	20.00
Nancy L. Donaldson	Nurse	20.00	12.00
Andrew E. Dunham	Acting ensign	24.00	12.00
Jeremiah Everly	Private	30.00	12.00
David B. Ellis	Paymaster's steward	40.00	12.00
Hezekiah Herriman, alias Charles Clifford	Sergeant	12.00	8.00
Henry A. Jordan	Private	24.00	6.00
James P. La Mott	First lieutenant	12.00	8.00
George Lee	do	25.00	17.00
Edward McDuffey	Coppersmith	30.00	8.00
Morton L. Phillips	Captain	20.00	8.00
Americus V. Rice	Colonel	100.00	36.00
Henry F. Rice	First lieutenant	50.00	30.00
Thomas H. Roberts	Sergeant	30.00	12.00
Smith Thompson	Second and first lieutenant	36.00	24.00
Peter Anderson	Private	30.00	12.00
William P. Aylesworth	do	24.00	12.00
Albert M. Bennett	do	20.00	12.00
Henry G. Bigelow	do	45.00	30.00
Alexander Boltin	do	24.00	12.00
David Briggs	do	12.00	12.00
Gorton Brown	do	30.00	12.00
Hiram M. Bryson	First lieutenant	17.00	10.00
Michael Dignon	Private	30.00	10.00
Thomas Duffy	do	20.00	8.00
Charles Forbes	do	24.00	17.00
Gabriel M. Funk	do	24.00	17.00
John H. Gardner	First lieutenant	30.00	12.00
William H. Gibbs	Captain	12.00	6.00
Franklin I. Gilbert	Private	17.00	6.00
Charles Gilpin	Lieutenant-colonel	30.00	8.00
Joel H. Hallowell	Private	30.00	12.00
Burwell Hinchman	Sergeant	24.00	17.00
Richard Holloway	Private	30.00	12.00
Michael Howlett	First lieutenant	30.00	12.00
John Kinsey	Private	24.00	12.00
George F. White	do	17.00	12.00
Lewis Wilson	Colonel	30.00	8.00
Joseph Zimmerman	Sergeant	17.00	8.00
Horace L. Stiles	Private	50.00	8.00
Orville H. Cram	do	17.00	8.00
H. S. Reed, alias Daniel Hull	Seaman	24.00	6.00
George P. Beach	Private	24.00	17.00
David E. Bedell	do	22.00	12.00
James Brown	First lieutenant	22.00	6.00
Francis H. Bufum	Sergeant	20.00	8.00
Charles C. Buntz	Private	24.00	12.00
Wm. J. Cannon, alias James Cannon	do	30.00	12.00
Bernard P. Chenoweth	Captain	30.00	20.00
William F. Cloud	Colonel	25.00	12.00
Horatio N. Davis	Captain	50.00	12.00
Robert A. Edwards, jr	Second lieutenant	24.00	15.00
George S. Fisher	Sergeant	12.00	8.00
Cyrus A. B. Fox	Musician	16.00	6.00
William Fox	Private	18.00	8.00
Charles Frye	Sergeant	30.00	20.00
Carroll W. Fuller	Private	20.00	10.00
John Geibel	do	30.00	12.00
William Gordon	Captain	30.00	24.00
Harvey Graham	Colonel	30.00	8.00
Richard O. Greenleaf	Captain	30.00	12.00
Joshua B. Harris	Corporal	20.00	12.00
Daniel L. Harbaugh	Private	24.00	12.00
Jacob Hight	do	30.00	17.00
Frederick O. Lathrop	do	16.00	8.00
George A. Libby	do	20.00	10.00
Leonhart Miller	do	12.00	8.00
Smith Miner	do	17.00	6.00
Madison McCollister	do	50.00	12.00
Matthew McDonald	do	50.00	24.00
George W. Myers	do	24.00	12.00
George W. Plants	Corporal	24.00	12.00
Richard H. Pond	First lieutenant	17.00	8.00
Robert A. Reid	Private	24.00	8.00
Thomas H. Roberts	Sergeant	30.00	12.00
Samuel Ryan	Quartermaster-sergeant	30.00	12.00
Lyman A. Sayles	Private	30.00	16.00
Channey Sheldon	do	24.00	17.00
Martin Sherwood	do	24.00	12.00
John C. Sheuerman	do	24.00	12.00

Name of soldier.	Rank and service.	Monthly rate—		Name of soldier.	Rank and service.	Monthly rate—	
		By special act.	Prior to special act.			By special act.	Prior to special act.
William Snider	Corporal	\$24.00	\$14.00	William H. Simmonds	Private	\$24.00	\$12.00
Louis Snyder	do	40.00	30.00	Daniel Smith	do	40.00	12.00
James Henry Stillman	Private	22.00	10.00	Samuel S. Stafford	First lieutenant	30.00	17.00
Thomas Tate	First lieutenant	17.00	8.00	Bela Sawyer	do	40.00	17.00
Henry S. Topping	Quartermaster-sergeant	50.00	17.00	William S. Swaney	Private	50.00	30.00
Amos Van Nausdile	Sergeant	20.00	10.00	Jacob E. Swap	do	40.00	24.00
John Walker	Private	30.00	12.00	Isaac D. Toll	Captain	12.00	8.00
Amos L. Hood	do	12.00	10.00	William M. Tom	Private	24.00	12.00
Hiram I. Hoyt	Corporal	30.00	12.00	James A. Thomas	do	45.00	8.00
Samuel N. Hoyt	Sergeant	30.00	12.00	Benjamin T. Thomas	do	30.00	12.00
Henry D. Johnson	Private	30.00	17.00	Hugh Thompson	do	24.00	12.00
John G. Merritt	Sergeant	12.00	8.00	Douglas Tolson	do	12.00	8.00
James M. McFry	Private	24.00	12.00	Daniel E. Turner	do	40.00	12.00
Oliver W. Miller	do	14.00	8.00	Ferdinand Wagner	do	30.00	16.00
William I. Miller	do	36.00	12.00	Edward Warner	do	40.00	12.00
Henry Muhs	Captain	50.00	12.00	Franklin Warren	do	24.00	10.00
George A. Parker	Sergeant	50.00	12.00	Henry L. Whitehead	First lieutenant	17.00	8.00
Thomas T. Phillips	Private	25.00	12.00	Edwin A. Wilson	First and second lieutenant	16.00	8.00
Ezra S. Pierce	do	24.00	17.00	William B. Wright	Colonel	40.00	30.00
Hiram J. Reamer	do	20.00	12.00	Andrew J. West	Private	40.00	16.00
Andrew Reed	do	30.00	14.00	John B. Frisbee	Seaman	12.00	12.00
Norton Schermerhorn	Sergeant	40.00	16.00	Samuel F. Bell	Private	24.00	17.00
Charles Stewart	Private	30.00	16.00	John H. Bliss	do	24.00	12.00
John D. Thompson	Corporal	24.00	12.00	John Burns	Corporal	14.00	6.00
Frederick Vogel	Private	24.00	17.00	Peter Brunette	Private	40.00	17.00
Bernard Wagner	Captain	24.00	12.00	Augustus L. Chetlain	Brigadier and brevet major-general	40.00	12.00
George S. Wentworth	Private	12.00	8.00	Solomon Delzell	Private	40.00	12.00
Ross Wheatley	do	30.00	17.00	Benjamin Eason	Captain	24.00	10.00
Joseph B. Whiting	Surgeon	50.00	23.00	Michael Falkoner	Private	30.00	12.00
Wiley J. Worley	Sergeant	15.00	8.00	Don Farrington	do	24.00	12.00
Andrew J. Woodman	First lieutenant	30.00	24.00	James Gatton	do	24.00	12.00
John D. Allen	Sergeant	17.00	12.00	Benjamin H. Gilman	Captain	30.00	20.00
James Barton	Private	30.00	12.00	Sylvanus A. Gifford	Corporal	30.00	12.00
Patrick Brennan	do	40.00	12.00	William Gross	do	24.00	12.00
Michael S. Brockett	Sergeant	30.00	16.00	Levi C. Hare	do	24.00	12.00
Henry H. Brown	Private	17.00	6.00	Jacob C. Hansel	First lieutenant	36.00	12.00
John E. Brown	do	12.00	8.00	Edgar Hill	Private	30.00	12.00
Albert Buck	do	24.00	12.00	Nicholas B. Ireland	do	40.00	12.00
Chamness S. Burks	Sergeant	30.00	12.00	Lealdea F. Lavery	do	30.00	24.00
James M. Campbell	Private	20.00	6.00	James Mason	do	30.00	12.00
Frank F. Carnduff	Corporal	24.00	17.00	Condy Menalis	do	12.00	8.00
Charles W. Clancy	Lieutenant-colonel	15.00	8.00	Reamus G. Morris	do	16.00	12.00
John D. Cohler	Corporal	50.00	36.00	Gilbert L. Pierce	do	36.00	12.00
Patrick Connelly	Private	30.00	24.00	William H. Ransom	do	36.00	12.00
Thomas A. Cord	First sergeant	50.00	30.00	Benjamin F. Shott	do	24.00	17.00
Robert P. Currin	Private	16.00	8.00	Julius Sporleder	Sergeant-major	30.00	12.00
George W. Cox, alias John Smith	Corporal	24.00	12.00	Philip Volkner	Private	24.00	12.00
Burdette N. Cleveland	Sergeant	30.00	12.00	Thomas J. Young	do	50.00	30.00
John W. Dinny	Colonel	25.00	8.00	William Ashmead	Captain	12.00	12.00
George H. Dobyns	Captain and assistant quartermaster	30.00	20.00	William L. Aten	Private	20.00	12.00
Albert L. Duddleson	Private	40.00	12.00	Philetus M. Axtel	Corporal	16.00	12.00
Edwin G. Fay	Second lieutenant	50.00	12.00	William H. Ball	Colonel	50.00	12.00
William P. Flynn	Private	18.00	8.00	Hubert Bascombe	Private	30.00	12.00
David Flinn	Landsman	20.00	12.00	James H. Bellinger	do	20.00	12.00
Franklin F. Flint	Colonel	24.00	8.00	George W. Bodurtha	do	20.00	8.00
Maurice Fitzgerald	First lieutenant	15.00	12.00	Charles Bridges	Sergeant	17.00	12.00
Johnson H. Fitzpatrick	Private	17.00	10.00	Alexander W. Browning	Private	40.00	30.00
Albert Foster	do	30.00	17.00	James F. Bruner	Assistant surgeon	17.00	12.00
William C. Griffin	do	20.00	8.00	George F. Burrage	Private	24.00	12.00
John W. Godfrey	Acting master	16.00	8.00	John W. Canaday	do	20.00	8.00
E. Bradford Gay	Private	50.00	24.00	Uriah Clark	Sergeant	20.00	16.00
Charles Hawkins	Seaman	40.00	22.00	Charles B. Cole	First sergeant	24.00	12.00
Aquilla Hardy	Private	25.00	12.00	Edmund B. Colhoun	Rear-admiral	40.00	30.00
Silas Howard	Corporal	25.00	12.00	Stacy H. Cogswell	Corporal	50.00	12.00
Edward Hause	Private	30.00	12.00	John T. Comegys	Private	50.00	30.00
Andrew J. Harbison	do	20.00	8.00	Edmund Cragg	do	20.00	8.00
Thomas Jefferson Holmes	do	36.00	12.00	Frank F. Crenshaw	Captain	50.00	28.00
George W. Hissey	do	25.00	12.00	Warren Damon	Sergeant	12.00	8.00
James R. Husted	do	30.00	12.00	Jesse N. Dawley	Private	24.00	17.00
John R. Joy	do	30.00	12.00	James C. Delaney	Musician	20.00	12.00
Amory K. Johnson	do	12.00	8.00	John W. Eichelberger	Corporal	24.00	14.00
Gideon Johnson	First lieutenant	50.00	30.00	David I. Ezekiel	Second lieutenant	20.00	15.00
Perry C. Jeffry	Private	12.00	6.00	Albert H. Fairchild	Private	30.00	6.00
William W. King	do	30.00	24.00	George W. Fansler	do	20.00	8.00
John T. Knox	do	12.00	8.00	Charles H. Force	Sergeant	24.00	8.00
Charles H. Knapp	Corporal	30.00	17.00	William H. Gardner	Second lieutenant	30.00	17.00
Jacob W. Kouts	do	36.00	12.00	William Grills	Private	25.00	12.00
Joseph Kemper	Private	20.00	12.00	Henry Guckes	Second lieutenant	30.00	12.00
Marcellus A. Lothrop	do	30.00	12.00	James W. Harden	Private	30.00	12.00
Elliott Loomis	do	20.00	8.00	Henry Holmes	Corporal	15.00	8.00
Joseph N. Loving	do	17.00	12.00	William I. Henry	Major	24.00	8.00
John Q. Mallard	do	12.00	8.00	John L. Hyde	Quartermaster-sergeant	17.00	8.00
Samuel Minnich	do	17.00	8.00	Lewis S. Horsey	Private	12.00	6.00
Robert H. Metcalf	do	25.00	12.00	Henry Hegwer	do	40.00	12.00
Richard P. Mitchell	Surgeon	25.00	12.00	Zadok S. Howe	do	50.00	12.00
George Mowry	Private	30.00	12.00	George C. Jarvis	Surgeon	50.00	12.00
Fred G. McDowell	do	24.00	12.00	Jeremiah Jackson	Private	12.00	8.00
John F. McGlensey	Captain	25.00	30.00	Robert H. Jones	do	40.00	12.00
John A. Nelson	Second-class boy	12.00	8.00	Linsay C. Jones	Corporal	12.00	6.00
Louis Nessell	Private	18.00	12.00	John Johnson	Private	36.00	24.00
George P. Overton	do	24.00	12.00	Theron Johnson	Paymaster's steward	30.00	12.00
James Paul	Sergeant	24.00	10.00	Morris B. Kimball	Private	30.00	12.00
Abram P. Pew	Private	30.00	17.00	Henry Keene	do	24.00	14.00
Lewis W. Phillips	do	30.00	17.00	Franklin Kersting	do	30.00	12.00
Francis H. Pike	Musician	24.00	10.00	Henry W. Lawton	Lieutenant-colonel	50.00	30.00
John R. Robinson	Private	24.00	12.00	Morris Leavey, alias Lewis	Sergeant	25.00	12.00
Aaron R. Rohrback	Corporal	20.00	12.00	Charles L. Leiper	Colonel	30.00	8.00
Gustav Rienecker	Second lieutenant	30.00	12.00	Elias M. Lynch	Private	12.00	8.00
Jerome R. Rowley	Corporal	60.00	45.00	Woodford H. Mabry	Colonel	50.00	30.00
William P. Rucker	Major	50.00	12.00	Charles A. Marsh	Private	50.00	12.00
James W. Russell	Chaplain	12.00	6.00	Fielding Marsh	do	20.00	12.00
Alexander C. Scott	Captain	30.00	12.00	Oscar A. Mack	Lieutenant-colonel	50.00	30.00
Daniel W. Shaw	Private	17.00	12.00	Jesse Millard	Corporal	30.00	6.00
William W. Schooley	do	40.00	30.00	James M. Munn	First lieutenant	50.00	30.00



Name of soldier.	Rank and service.	Monthly rate—	
		By special act.	Prior to special act.
Samuel Z. Murphy	Private	\$24.00	\$17.00
John W. Phillips	do	24.00	12.75
William J. Potts	do	20.00	8.00
Hippolyte Perrault	First lieutenant	30.00	12.00
Adolphus Richardson	Corporal	24.00	8.00
Martin Rodman	Sergeant	40.00	24.00
James Ryan	Private	30.00	12.00
Selah V. Reeve	Captain	24.00	12.00
John Scott	Private	24.00	10.00
Charles Scott	Lieutenant-colonel	50.00	22.50
Charles T. Shaw	First lieutenant	24.00	12.75
Peter Shelt	Private	25.00	12.00
Samuel H. Smith	do	20.00	8.00
Henry Smith	do	20.00	12.00
George Starr	do	20.00	8.00
Charles L. Summers	Second lieutenant	15.00	12.00
Norman Stewart	First lieutenant and regimental quartermaster	17.00	8.00
George N. Tarburton	First sergeant	20.00	12.00
Asa W. Taylor	Corporal	30.00	24.00
John H. Taylor	Private	30.00	12.00
John F. Townsend	First-class fireman	30.00	12.00
Marvin V. Tufford	Private	24.00	14.00
Edward W. Ward	Captain	30.00	17.00
Daniel W. Warren	Private	50.00	24.00
Thomas M. Wimer	do	20.00	8.00
Merit C. Welsh	Colonel	30.00	20.00
William C. Whitney	First lieutenant	30.00	12.00
Charles F. Williams	Colonel	50.00	30.00
Elijah Baxter	Private	30.00	12.00
William H. H. Bouslough	do	12.00	6.00
Lewis Black	do	30.00	12.00
Samuel Baughman	do	12.00	6.00
John F. Carbee	do	12.00	6.00
Henry H. Coston	Captain	20.00	15.00
Upton F. Cramer	Private	15.00	8.00
Ajax Causey	do	20.00	8.00
Ezekiel Dawson	Assistant surgeon	30.00	17.00
Isaac H. Duvall	Brigadier-general	50.00	30.00
Milbre V. Douglass	Sergeant	40.00	30.00
William N. Hall	Quartermaster-sergeant	20.00	12.00
John A. Hardy	Private	12.00	8.00
William Hays	Brigadier-general	50.00	30.00
John W. Horner	Private	24.00	12.00
James Hickey	Sergeant	30.00	12.00
Peter M. Hill	Captain	30.00	12.00
Alfred H. Jones	Private	50.00	36.00
Thomas J. Kerstetter	Corporal	50.00	24.00
Edgar F. Koehler	First lieutenant	25.00	17.00
Eugene Leahy	Coal heaver	40.00	12.00
Charles W. Little	Private	30.00	12.00
Samuel A. Needham	do	17.00	8.00
Albert Pratt	Artificer	12.00	8.00
Charles C. Parsons	Captain	20.00	8.00
Roddie Reynolds	Acting master's mate	20.00	12.00
George B. Smith	Sergeant	17.00	12.00
Samuel C. F. Seabury	Corporal	30.00	12.00
Sidney E. Stuart	Captain	30.00	20.00
Francis M. Thompson	Musician	60.50	50.00
Nehemiah Tunis	Captain	20.00	12.00
Grotius N. Udell	Private	72.00	36.00
Total		16,348.00	6,319.00

Here are cases of \$12 to \$24, \$12 to \$30, \$12 to \$50, \$8 to \$20, \$12 to \$40, \$6 to \$24, \$14 to \$50, \$14 to \$30, \$12 to \$36, \$6 to \$17, \$8 to \$30, \$12 to \$24, \$8 to \$20, \$25 to \$40, \$36 to \$100, and so on through the entire list.

No doubt many of these bills ought not to have passed. This House ought to be able to establish some rule by which injustice shall not be done to that great body of pensioners who have received consideration at the Pension Bureau, and who are not knocking at the doors of Congress for increases by private acts, by refusing to give others who had either no title or one so defective that the Bureau refused to give any pension even greater pensions by private acts than if they had perfect and indefeasible title under general law.

Now, we will say, for example, that \$20 per month should be the highest amount allowed under general law to soldiers of the Mexican war or to soldiers of the war between the States under the act of 1890, both being dependent service-pension acts.

No private bill should be reported for a greater amount. The act of July 14, 1890, provides for a pension of \$12 per month where there is dependency. Now, how much should we, by general law, in case of total disability allow? Suppose the amount should be \$20 per month, same as we would allow the Mexican soldier. No private bill should be passed for more than that amount. In such cases let the committee refuse to report and the House refuse to pass a bill for a greater amount. If the amount fixed by general law is not high enough, then let it be increased by general law.

Of course I assume that nothing except honorable influence is exerted. But we know that often a worthy, a popular, a strong member of this House goes to either of these committees and says, "I have a constituent who is in a terrible condition," and then

he describes the man's condition. He says "I want you to do the best you can for him in regard to this pension." Then members, on account of the pitiful description given of the particular case and on account of the influence of the member who introduced the bill, are induced to give more than would otherwise be granted. But the member who asks the committee to do more for a particular individual than the member would be willing to do for the constituent of any other member on the floor is doing wrong.

I ask whether any member here has ever heard a member make a motion to reduce the amount allowed by the committee? I have known of only one member, whose name I will not mention, who has ever moved such an amendment. But, on the other hand, how often is it the fact that after the committee has given a pension bill mature deliberation, careful consideration, and decided to report a bill liberal in its provisions, some member of the House, eloquent perhaps, strong in personal influence, has asked the House to increase the amount of the proposed pension beyond what the committee has reported and to do this upon a statement which he makes here on the floor.

I criticize, and I think justly, any such proceeding. If there should be reported from the committee a bill for an insufficient amount, the proper method to pursue is to ask that the bill be reconsidered, or, if necessary, recommitted, and then let the committee hear the evidence offered which they did not at first have before them, and determine the question. But, sir, the committee has little inducement to be reasonable and conservative in its action if, when it makes a report, the amount allowed in the report is increased on the floor of this House—increased, it may be, without additional evidence bearing upon the case. Such action by the House is impliedly a rebuke to the committee. It is equivalent to saying to the committee, "You have not treated this soldier fairly and justly." I repeat that if there is evidence in such a case that was not submitted to the committee the bill ought to be recommitted and the committee allowed to consider the new evidence.

For reasons like these ever since I have been a member of this House I have always supported the action of the committee, because I believe they have the best opportunity to consider the merits of the case. They are in fact the only members who have such opportunity. They are no doubt influenced often in their action by the personal appeals of members in particular cases, but this influence does not operate upon the committee to the extent that it does upon the House. When an impassioned appeal is made here in behalf of some poor, deserving soldier we all feel kindly and sympathetic, and we are apt to go wild and sometimes grant a pension four times, five times, or six times larger than the soldier can get at the Pension Bureau under the general law and the established rulings of the Department.

Now, my friends, the granting of increased pensions in these exceptional cases is not going to help you at home. We will suppose that in fifty cases where applications are made from your district for increase of pensions you succeed in getting through the increase in two or three cases. You do not help yourself at home. We from the South are perhaps in a better position for success in cases of this kind than others; no doubt a greater percentage of our bills are passed than of other members, because there are fewer applications from the South. The soldiers who served in the Spanish war are from all parts of the Union, not entirely from one section. And we at the South are going to have trouble in regard to this matter. I appeal to the wisdom of the House to deal with this question seriously, honorably, liberally. Let us settle these matters as far as possible by general legislation. Let us have in this House no applications or very rare applications for increases; and when such increases are granted, let them be reasonable in amount and let them be uniform. Here are hundreds of bills on this Calendar in which increases are reported from \$8 to \$20; from \$12 to \$24; from \$12 to \$34; from \$12 to \$50. There is no uniformity in these increases. No rule seems to be followed, either by members of the committee or by the House.

I indulge in no criticism of gentlemen who are members of the Pension Committee, because they are subjected to these appeals year in and year out, and it is but human nature to give way to the pleadings of want and suffering. But it is the duty of this House to act intelligently and justly on these applications.

I want to say something, not in any spirit of criticism, but simply because it appears to be a fact. As I said, I have no thought of criticising any member of the Pension Committee unjustly, because I know and respect them all and think that they are as good as I am, and may be better under like circumstances, but three members of this committee come from one State.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. What State is that?

Mr. SIMS. The State of Michigan. Two of them come from the State of Indiana. It is no reflection if they all come from either of those States. They could, and still be very good men; but the applicants for private acts from those States have an



advantage which can not be prevented. Now, I wish to show you just a few figures here. Take the State of Indiana. The number of pensioners in that State is 66,974, and the gross amount paid by this Government to those pensioners is \$10,291,896.75 per annum. That State has two members on the committee. Now, let us take the great State of Illinois, right beside it, and I suppose that State furnished pro rata as many soldiers as did Indiana. That State has on the pension roll 70,481, a greater number by several thousand than Indiana, and those pensioners receive \$9,757,003.75. Let us take the State of Michigan, with three members on the committee. There are on the roll from Michigan 44,050 pensioners, who receive \$6,653,101.55. Now take the State of Pennsylvania. Pennsylvania has on the pension roll 104,345, and they receive \$13,378,371. The average annual value of a pension in Michigan is, in round numbers, \$150, while the average value in Pennsylvania is but \$125. The average annual value in Indiana, in round numbers, is \$150, while in Illinois it is \$137.

Mr. SULLOWAY. Will the gentleman yield a moment?

Mr. SIMS. Certainly.

Mr. SULLOWAY. Does the gentleman contend that the allowance made to these pensioners can in any way be affected by the Committee on Invalid Pensions or the Committee on Pensions?

Mr. SIMS. Only in this way: With a greater number of members on the committee there is a better opportunity for those applying for private pensions from that particular State to get them reported.

Mr. SULLOWAY. But a very small per cent of those you name are by private act.

Mr. SIMS. I must state that I do not know just how many are by private act; neither do I know how it happens that three members of this committee come from one State and two members from another.

Mr. SULLOWAY. I want to say in answer to that, if the gentleman will pardon me, that Michigan gets no advantage in that. One of those three members is assigned to the committee that has the territory of Michigan in charge and the other two are somewhere else.

Mr. SIMS. Why, Mr. Chairman, as far as I know, they may be the very best members of that committee. Some of them I know personally and regard them highly; but an analysis of the figures that I have quoted shows that from some cause there is a great disparity in the average value of pensions from different States where the soldiers seem to have had the same service.

Mr. MAHON. Will the gentleman yield a moment?

Mr. SIMS. Yes.

Mr. MAHON. I would like to state that troops from different States were frequently in more severe battles than troops from other States, and in that way more men were badly injured than others. This disparity that the gentleman speaks of comes from the service. It can not be regulated in any way.

Mr. SIMS. I can not go into all the causes, but I think it is a significant fact that the average value of a pension from your State is \$125, taking the whole State over, and from the State of Michigan it is \$150.

Mr. MAHON. It comes because of severe service.

Mr. SIMS. Of course, that applies to the Bureau and to private legislation; but I am pointing out that injustice does exist and it exists in considering bills on this floor. Why, no longer ago than the last pension day a distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania rose and made one of the most tender and appealing speeches I ever heard, asking an increase in a pension bill over the committee's report. The committee opposed it through one of its members and the increase was not made, and I thought properly—not that I doubted the gentleman's word, but he ought to have given the information he stated to the House to the committee.

Then another gentleman on this side of the House rose and asked for an increase of pension from \$24, as reported, to \$36. By special act that had already, as I recollect it, been doubled by the committee. The gentleman to whom I refer made statements that, I think, should have been considered by the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and the chairman of that committee very kindly stated that the committee reported all they thought the applicant ought to have with the evidence before them, but that he could not question the word of the distinguished gentleman on this side [Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee], and therefore made no objection, and it went right through. Now, was there any more justice in denying the Pennsylvania soldier an increase than the Tennessee soldier?

Mr. SULLOWAY. If the gentleman will permit me, I would like to say that the gentleman on your side of the House produced some evidence here that was not before the committee and he made a much stronger case, and that was the reason for raising no objection.

Mr. SIMS. I understand that, and that is the reason the chairman stated what he did. But are we to be witnesses in all of these cases on the floor of the House and not before the committee? We can not get up here and question what a member says. He says what he believes to be true and his information may be true; but I say, let him go to the committee and make these statements.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SIMS. I would like to have five minutes more.

Mr. HITT. I yield five minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. SIMS. If a member of this House gets information after the bill has been reported, why then let him ask that the bill be recommitted, and let it come regularly. Now, what is the result of our present methods? What would the entire pension roll amount to if acted on by Congress in this way? I have shown you what 465 cases amount to, that it amounts to double what could have been obtained under the general law. A man goes before the Pension Bureau with an imperfect title. If he had a good title he would get \$12, but he can not make it and he does not get anything. Then he comes here, and out of kindness of heart and liberality the House gives him \$24, when he could not have gotten over \$12 if he had had a good title. I say that the House ought to hold itself down, and whenever they give a pension to a man because of his not being able to strictly comply with all the technicalities of the law they should not give him more than he would have received if he had the proper proof at the Bureau. There are hundreds of soldiers of like service, where there is no doubt of their injury, who receive their pension by the Bureau, and they make no complaint, but those who have a doubtful title come here and are awarded 100 per cent over what they could have obtained if they had had a good title.

Mr. SULLOWAY. Will the gentleman yield a moment?

Mr. SIMS. Yes.

Mr. SULLOWAY. I think that is a very unfair statement in view of the fact that when a claimant has made a case before the Bureau with evidence sufficient to hang any member of this House before an intelligent jury, and he is rejected, then the Committee on Pensions gives him what it thinks he ought to have upon that evidence.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, I do not know just how much evidence it would take to hang a member of this House. It might not take very much in some cases, but I am presuming that the law officers of this Government do their duty. If they do not, why do they remain in office?

Mr. SULLOWAY. That is a violent presumption in that case.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order. If any gentleman desires to ask a question, he will rise to his feet and address the Chair.

Mr. SIMS. I want to state that I believe that if the pension roll of \$140,000,000, in round numbers, was revised by Congressional action, it would amount to \$400,000,000.

I want to state now a little experience of my own, and I hope nobody will ask me to give the name. A man asked me to introduce a bill to increase his pension. He was getting \$12. I introduced a bill for twenty. It was reported at sixteen. The evidence of the physician was all right, showing that this increase was fully warranted. The bill was passed and signed by the President, and I wrote him a letter about it. He wrote back and thanked me very much; but he said, "Since that proof was taken I have gotten a great deal worse. Please introduce a bill for \$30." [Laughter.]

They do not all do that, but the idea that each man must get as much as every other man does prevail to a great extent, and we must remove, if possible, the impression among the soldiers of the country that they are not fairly treated, and that those who receive pensions by private legislation are preferred to those who receive pensions under the general law.

Mr. Chairman, I said one year ago in this presence that as long as I remained in this House I should continue in my humble way to make the best fight I could against extravagant and unreasonable pension legislation, either by general law or by private act, and I am now trying to redeem that promise. I am glad that there is much to encourage me in this determination. Since that pledge was made to the House and the country I have seen the total amount appropriated for pensions shrink more than \$5,000,000 in one year, while the number of pensioners on the roll have increased more than 4,000. If I could only have more help in this undertaking from members on this side, I would have reason to believe that even greater results would follow; but if I have to continue to do this work alone, as my good friend from South Carolina, Mr. TALBERT, is going to leave us, I shall not cease my efforts as long as they are crowned with so much evidence of success.

Mr. HITT. Mr. Chairman, after consultation with my colleague as to the time he desires, I ask unanimous consent that the general debate be closed at half past 2 o'clock.



The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that general debate close at half past 2 o'clock. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HITT. I ask the Chair to recognize the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RICHARDSON] for thirty minutes.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, in the time allotted to me this morning, I desire briefly to call attention to what I believe to be some of the mistakes and errors that appear in two carefully prepared speeches delivered in this House by the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CORLISS] on the subject of the Pacific cable.

The bill favoring Government construction and ownership of the telegraphic cable line from the coast of California to Manila has been reported favorably from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, accompanied by a minority report.

Now, it is not my purpose or desire, Mr. Chairman, to criticize or to animadvert in any improper way upon the eagerness and haste of the gentleman from Michigan or the manner in which he has so earnestly disseminated and given his views to the country before the members of the House had an opportunity to read either the majority or the minority report, and from those reports learn what the real facts are and what the conditions and circumstances are. I say I will not criticize that; that is a matter of mere taste. But I do say, Mr. Chairman, that the circumstances under which it was done lead one reasonably to believe that there was a manifest and decided disposition upon the part of the gentleman from Michigan to have this House and the country prejudge the question in advance of discussion.

Now, it appears to me, Mr. Chairman, that this precipitate and untimely haste in rushing into the discussion of this Pacific cable question—more hurried than Hamlet's mother's marriage to the husband's brother—leaves the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CORLISS] in the unpleasant attitude of the "agitator of old," of whom it was said, "The zeal of thine house has eaten thee up."

I do not think, Mr. Chairman, that this is the opportune time to discuss the question in full and according to all of its merits, as to whether the Government should construct and own this Pacific cable, or whether it should be constructed by a private corporation. But it seems to me that it is but just and fair to all concerned in this important matter that the attention of the House and country should be called to the manifest errors of statements and facts occurring in the speeches made by the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, and they ought to be corrected. I do not believe that any gentleman on this floor ought to criticize, impugn, or malign the motives of anyone—individual or corporation—that has not here the right of reply.

I hope that I do not possess any partiality or prejudice that would lead me under any circumstances to accord to a corporation any privilege or advantage that it ought not to have, or to take from that corporation any legal right that it has; and I can say here for myself that, in the many years of my professional experience, I have never had the pleasure or the honor of representing a corporation.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in the first instance, I desire to call the attention of the House to a paragraph in the speech of the gentleman from Michigan, in which he uses this language, in the RECORD of February 19, page 2027:

But, recognizing the importance of Government ownership and control, she—

Referring to Great Britain—

has contracted for the construction of a cable over 7,000 miles in length, extending from Vancouver, in the British possessions, down through the Pacific, connecting all of her islands, including Australia and New Zealand.

This, Mr. Chairman, is adroitly intended to commit this House, in its tendencies at least, to Government ownership by the precedent claimed to be established by Great Britain.

Now, I am not disposed in any way to criticize Great Britain. I have not any tendency or disposition in that respect. I recognize it as a great Government that has furnished us with the wonderful principles of the common law, and that we are indebted to it in a great many respects. Therefore I am not here, nor am I disposed in any way, to criticize or speak unkindly of Great Britain in any of her matters, as we hear so frequently done. I desire to see the commercial, social, and political relations of our country and Great Britain most friendly and cordial. Now, what is the real truth of the paragraph just read—and I beg to call the attention of the House to it. The fact is undeniable, and I call the attention of my friend from Michigan, with whom I have the pleasure and honor of serving on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, that the English Government repeatedly offered a large subsidy to any private company that would build this cable, and tried over and over again with her best and ablest diplomacy to avoid its construction as a Government cable.

Mr. CORLISS. Will the gentleman permit an inquiry?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. Certainly.

Mr. CORLISS. Has the gentleman read the proceedings had by the British Parliament on the construction of this Pacific cable, in which it was determined that a Government cable was necessary for the protection of Great Britain and her interests?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. I will answer my friend during the course of my remarks.

Mr. CORLISS. If not, I will produce the document for him.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. I will say, like I have heard my distinguished friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] say so often on the floor of this House, "Oh, we are not talking about that right now; wait until I get to it." [Laughter.] But no private corporation could be induced to take that risk; and I have the evidence of it here or I would not have made that statement. In a speech before the board of directors of the Eastern Extension Cable Company, that my friend speaks so much about, in December last, Sir John Pender, the president of that company, stated that he had again declined, under the offer of a large subsidy by the British Government, to agree to lay a cable from Vancouver to Australia. It had been offered over and over again, and again he had declined.

He emphasized, Mr. Chairman, his unwillingness to undertake the risk of such a cable for so long a distance in unknown waters. And I contend now, Mr. Chairman, that when such an erroneous and misleading statement as that is sent broadcast to the country, and that in advance of a proper discussion in the Congress of the United States, it seems to me that this is sufficient to challenge and invite the inquiry of the House and the country as to what had induced such an assertion on the part of the gentleman from Michigan and what such reckless zeal means.

Mr. CORLISS. Will the gentleman permit another question?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. Well, not now. I will when I get through.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. Yes, for the present—just for the present. Now, I call your attention again, Mr. Chairman, to an inaccuracy and error that the gentleman makes in his report. In the report made by the gentleman himself from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce he uses this language:

For fifty years England has been constantly acquiring by purchase and construction cable communication with her vast possessions, until she has expended upward of a hundred millions of dollars for that purpose and operates over 20,000 miles of her own cable lines connecting her colonies.

Now, let us examine that.

The fact is, Mr. Chairman, that the English Government has never to this day owned a long submarine cable. The English Government has a one-half interest only in the short channel cable connecting England with France, Belgium, Holland, and Germany. These countries insisted upon owning an equal interest in these cables, because they would not allow cables owned by another country to land on their shores. Now let us see if this is true. I call the attention of the House to the testimony that was taken in the Fifty-sixth Congress—and my friend from Michigan ought to have known better and must have known better when he made that statement. Listen. This is the testimony given by Mr. Scrymser, one of the men who has wonderfully changed his attitude on the question of Government ownership and individual building of a cable since last Congress.

I read from the testimony taken in the Fifty-sixth Congress before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee:

Mr. SCRYMSER. I should like to ask if the United States Government would permit a foreign government to land and operate a government-owned cable on the coast of the United States?

Mr. CORLISS. Let me answer that question by the Yankee notion of asking another question. How many cables owned by Great Britain are laid and operated by her, connecting her with foreign lands? Foreign to herself, I mean.

Mr. SCRYMSER. I will explain that. The Submarine Telegraph Company, operating all the cables between England and the Continent, was an English corporation. When the English Government bought out the telegraph system of Great Britain it also bought a majority of the shares of the Submarine Telegraph Company, just as it bought a majority of the shares of the Suez Canal. Those shares are held by the English Government, and it is not a government cable. The Government is simply a shareholder, subject to all the conditions of the concessions held by the parent company.

Mr. CORLISS. Great Britain owns it and controls it, however?

Mr. SCRYMSER. Owns and controls it, and it owns it and controls it under the concessions granted to the Submarine Telegraph Company, which would give France the right to close any office at any time.

Mr. CORLISS. Do you mean by that to be understood to say that Great Britain has not to-day in her own individual right a cable upon foreign shores?

Mr. SCRYMSER. Only through the medium of a corporation which held concessions for that purpose and under which France and other countries have reserved the right to close at any moment.

Mr. CORLISS. You mean to say that Great Britain has none at all in her own right?

Mr. SCRYMSER. That is right, so far as relates to cable connection with foreign shores.

Now, Mr. Chairman, another point in my friend's speech, and he resorts to what he says is the "deadly parallel." I read, Mr.



Chairman, from the RECORD the deadly parallel that the gentleman from Michigan uses in his speech on February 14, and I submit that the deduction that I propose to make about which he complains in his two speeches—I submit it to the common sense and the business sense of this House and ask if there is anything in it that any business man can possibly object to.

The first deadly parallel is:

(1) That neither the company, its successors or assigns, nor any cable with which it connects, shall receive from any foreign government exclusive privileges which would prevent the establishment and operation of a cable of an American company in the jurisdiction of such foreign government.

(2) That the company shall not consolidate or amalgamate with any other line or combine therewith for the purpose of regulating rates.

The next one, where he says is the "deadly" sting:

(1) That neither this company, its successors or assigns, nor any cable with which it connects (and over which it exercises control) shall receive from any foreign government exclusive privileges which would prevent the establishment and operation of a cable of an American company in the jurisdiction of such foreign government.

(2) That the company will not consolidate or amalgamate with any other line or combine therewith for the purpose of regulating rates (except to make through rates).

Now, the objection that he makes so earnestly and vociferously is of the addition of the words "over which it exercises control," in the first paragraph, and the next is the addition of the words "except to make through rates" as they appear in the second paragraph.

The gentleman claims to expose "the villainy" of the Commercial Pacific Cable Company and "its rascally modifications" by the use of this deadly parallel. I most respectfully submit the inevitable deduction from the "deadly parallel" to the business common sense of the House. It appears to me that a very appropriate parallel can be made, if we recall it, of the mountain that labored, and you know the result.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Michigan contends that the words in the parentheses, as I have read them, and printed in italics, are "rascally modifications" which the officers of the Commercial Cable Company thought were so ingeniously devised as not to be discovered, or that the Secretary of State and the President of the United States were too stupid or indifferent to the public welfare to detect the villainy in them. Such, Mr. Chairman, is the violent and aggressive language that the gentleman from Michigan uses throughout both of his untimely delivered speeches, when he refers to the Commercial Cable Company that makes the simple and plain proposition to build this cable without asking a subsidy from the Government.

Why, I ask, this intemperate language? The gentleman calls most pathetically upon the members of this House who have had no opportunity to see the majority report or the minority report to come to the rescue, and in conclusion he says: "Are the members of this House willing to be charged with the disposition of Nero? Are they to sleep while this American ally usurps the rights of the people and steals the greatest public franchise now held by our country?"

If I have read tradition aright, the gentleman departs from the parallel, because my understanding is that Nero did not sleep while Rome was burning, but he "played the fiddle." [Laughter.]

But let us look a little bit further to the deadly parallel. What is there, I ask you, in the modification complained of and charged to be so rascally and ingenious, devised to mislead, and which was designed to impose upon the well-established diplomatic acumen of the Secretary of State and to blind the perceptive faculties of the President of the United States with his well-known disposition and capacity to detect fraud and deception?

The language used is plain in these italics; it is simple and easily understood. The complaint is about the insertion of the words "and over which it exercises control," in the first paragraph, and the insertion of the words "except to make through rates," in the second paragraph.

Now, I propound this question to the members of this House: How could the Commercial Pacific Cable Company or any other cable company accept or refuse to have anything to do with concessions or privileges over a cable line over which it did not exercise control or over which it has no ownership? How can the United States Government restrict privileges to foreign cables by a foreign government simply because the United States cable connects with such foreign government? How can the United States Government cable get messages to foreign countries unless it connects with foreign cables? How can it do it? The only way it can refuse to connect with foreign cables would be for the United States Government cable or the United States cable corporation to encircle the globe and thereby bring about the octopus monopoly so greatly dreaded by the gentleman from Michigan.

Every American cable in the Atlantic "connects" per force with the foreign cable companies in Europe. Otherwise its messages could not be delivered. It is remarkable logic to undertake

to make American companies responsible for the exclusive privileges possessed by foreign companies. The Commercial Cable Company is also taken to task for including in the clause of its petition "that the company will not consolidate or amalgamate with any other line or combine for the purpose of regulating rates" and addition of the words "except to make through rates." It is plain to see that the United States Cable Company would be obliged to enter into some arrangement with foreign companies in order to make through rates. Without this reduced through rates could not be had. By means of this the Commercial Pacific Cable Company, which formerly caused the rates to China to be reduced from \$3.35 a word to \$1.66 a word, has arranged for further reduction, which they guarantee from \$1.66 a word to \$1 a word.

Suppose the same policy of complaint was put in operation as to railroads and all other land or water line transportation forbidding through rates. What would the business interests of this country say to such a proposition as that?

The gentleman from Michigan, in the report of the committee, says:

It has been claimed, and we would be pleased to have this cable monopolist deny, that Germany offers a subsidy for the construction of this cable so as to connect its Marshall Islands instead of the island of Guam, where our country has a naval station that demands cable communication.

It will be understood by this House that the only difficulty in reference to the all-American cable occurs in the deep waters around Guam, and it may be that this difficulty can not be avoided and thereby an all-American cable not secured. The testimony before the committee discloses the fact that the waters near Guam are the deepest in the world.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in answer to that error, misstatement, inaccuracy, or inadvertence in the gentleman's speech, I have this to say: The Commercial Cable Company has denied and does deny this statement. There is a letter here from Mr. Ward, vice-president and general manager, an active, intelligent, and leading man in the Commercial Pacific Cable Company, that denies it emphatically. This letter is here for inspection. This company declares that Germany has, neither directly nor indirectly, offered them any subsidy or any other inducement whatever to land a cable on the Marshall or any other island.

The company has further guaranteed—and I want you to listen to this, and we have a copy of the bond of that company attached to the minority report of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee—the company has further guaranteed that they will land on American soil, if that be a physical possibility, and they have asserted their anxiety to make a bond agreement to this effect as soon as they can ascertain through the Navy Department soundings or through soundings of their own that it will be physically possible to land a cable at Guam. They have stated, in my opinion, sound and good reasons for objecting to landing on German soil, because they would thereby be compelled to give half rates to the German Government and be subject to other restrictions that the German Government might see proper to impose.

Why, Mr. Chairman, the Government ownership bill, reported by the gentleman from Michigan, states that the cable shall be constructed by the way of Guam "by whatever route may be determined to be the most practicable by the President."

That is the provision of the gentleman's bill. Does not this paragraph inserted in the bill indicate an uncertainty? It is an admission that it may not be possible to land a cable at Guam or to construct an all-American cable. And yet this Commercial Cable Company, which has made so fair and liberal a proposition to the Government, is charged with these sinister motives because, forsooth, they say "if practicable" they will build an all-American cable.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. HITT. I have no more time or I would yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. I would be glad to have my time extended for a few minutes, by unanimous consent.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks.

Mr. CLAYTON. I ask unanimous consent that my colleague be allowed an extension of fifteen minutes.

Mr. HITT. That motion will have to be modified in some way, because by unanimous consent a time has been fixed for closing general debate. If this request is agreed to, it will have to be understood that the time for closing debate will be deferred for fifteen minutes and this additional fifteen minutes given to the gentleman from Alabama.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CLAYTON] asks unanimous consent that the time for general debate be extended for fifteen minutes.

Mr. CLAYTON. And that those fifteen minutes be given to my colleague.

The CHAIRMAN. Unanimous consent is asked that the time for closing general debate be extended for fifteen minutes and



that the gentleman from Alabama be now allowed an extension of fifteen minutes. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. Now, my friend from Michigan becomes really dramatic when he uses this expression in one of his speeches:

The audacity of this octopus and the villainous ingenuity with which it seeks to evade the conditions imposed upon other cable companies, and extend its tentacles over our islands in the Pacific, and fasten its grasping clutch upon the wheels of progress so rapidly moving from our country toward the Pacific Ocean is marvelously ingenious and the most audacious usurper of public rights of the present age.

Why, Mr. Chairman, such hyperbolic language as this carries us back to the days when Socialists and Populists talked flippantly about that wonderful "octopus" that was winding itself slowly (in their heated imagination) around the body politic of this great Government of ours and squeezing the very lifeblood out of all of us. The gentleman from Michigan surely must possess well-defined Populistic views and tendencies. On March 6, at Indianapolis, in the year 1900, Eugene Debs was nominated for President of the United States on this declaration:

The public ownership of all railroads, telegraph and telephone, and all means of transportation and communication, all waterworks, gas and electric plants, and other public utilities.

On the 2d day of July, 1892, James B. Weaver was nominated for President on this declaration:

Transportation being a means of exchange and a public necessity, the Government should own and operate the railroads in the interests of the people, and the telegraph and telephone, like the post-office system, being a necessity for the transmission of news, should be owned and operated by the Government in the interests of the people.

Now, let us look at what the gentleman from Michigan says on that subject.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. Yes; what is it?

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I would like to ask the gentleman if he was aware that Thomas Benton, before there was ever a Populist heard of, advocated the building of the Atlantic and Pacific Railroad by the United States?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. No. I have not gone back to ancient history. I have just gone back to Debs and Weaver.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. That was advocated by Thomas Benton and John C. Calhoun.

I will read from the report of the gentleman from Michigan, at page 8. Listen to it, and I ask you to institute the "deadly parallel" between the declarations in the platform of Debs and of Weaver and what the gentleman from Michigan says in this report. He says:

The transmission of communication should be held by the State. The Post-Office Department is undoubtedly the most useful arm of our Government, and has given to our people, through the blessings of rapid communication at the least possible cost, the greatest benefits and contributed most to the progress of the nation.

I leave it to the fair and unbiased judgment of this House to say what the parallel is between the position of the gentleman from Michigan and the platforms upon which Debs and Weaver were nominated. It is not my purpose, Mr. Chairman, at this time to enter upon the discussion of the acceptance by the Commercial Cable Company of the provisions of the postal act of 1866, or the authority of the President or the Secretary of State as to the landing of cables on American soil.

I simply refer to what I believe to be certain inaccuracies in order to put this House and the country on notice that it will not be well to decide this question until the facts on both sides can be regularly and fully presented. The complicated question, Mr. Chairman, of cable manufacture and management, the relative costs of Government and private ownership, the advisability of the Government invading the private field of enterprise—all of these great questions and many others should be carefully examined into before our judgment is rendered upon this important subject. This question has been ably discussed in past Congresses, and it is quite interesting to examine the present attitude of some of the leading parties as compared with their attitudes in the past. Mr. Scrymser, the president of the Mexican Telegraph Company, the Central and South American Telegraph Company, and the Pacific Cable Company, says in evidence taken before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House:

Mr. SCRYMSER. I have appeared before this committee frequently during the past five years and advocated the establishment of a private cable and opposed the establishment of a Government-owned cable.

Mr. SCRYMSER. President of the Mexican Telegraph Company, the Central and South America Telegraph Company, and the Pacific Cable Company. Mr. Baylies is with me, and he can give you some information affecting these exclusive rights in a way which I think would be far more accurate and intelligent than I can present it.

Mr. MANN. Have your companies any special connection or relation with the Western Union Telegraph Company?

Mr. SCRYMSER. Yes, sir; we have a traffic agreement.

Mr. MANN. I suppose it is a good thing once in a while to get down to what they call "brass tacks," and get a little information. If the Pacific Commercial Cable Company strikes a line across the Pacific with an arrangement

with the Eastern Company, do you consider that that will be a discrimination against the Western Union Telegraph Company?

Mr. SCRYMSER. Undoubtedly; that is the rock on which we split.

Mr. MANN. That is the real reason you are now in favor of Government ownership, or one of the reasons?

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. Will my colleague state whether the bill he is now advocating is in the interest of the Western Union Telegraph Company?

Mr. CORLISS. I am very glad to have that question asked at this time. In the Fifty-fifth Congress there were pending two measures, one in behalf of what was known as the Pacific Cable Company, controlled by Mr. Scrymser, who sought to obtain the right to lay this cable with a subsidy; and another company, in whose interest the Commercial Cable Company seemed to be associated, sought also the privilege with a subsidy. One of those bills was reported to the House carrying a subsidy of, I think, \$400,000 per annum. It was in behalf of the Pacific Cable Company, associated with which is supposed to be the Western Union interest in the cable across the Atlantic. They were undoubtedly interested in that bill, as the Commercial Cable Company, now seeking to usurp the right, was anxious to defeat that bill or pass one for its own use.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want simply in conclusion to refer to the report of the minority on this subject. The minority of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee says:

We dissent from the majority report. In our judgment the Government should not undertake to construct a cable to the Hawaiian Islands and the Philippines. A private corporation, the Commercial Pacific Cable Company, has given the assurance that a contract has been let by it for the manufacture and laying of a cable from San Francisco to the Hawaiian Islands, and that that cable will be in operation by November 1 of this year. That company has declared that it intends to complete a cable to Manila within two years thereafter.

We attach hereto a proposed contract executed on behalf of the Commercial Cable Company, under which said company claims this Government can obtain the advantages of the completion of a cable at an early day, and the probability of governmental ownership, and avoid the risks and disadvantages of governmental ownership by allowing a private corporation to lay and operate its cable. Moreover, we do not think it right for the Government to lay this cable after a private corporation has started to lay such a cable. It appears also that this Commercial Pacific Cable Company, having filed with the Postmaster-General its acceptance of a certain act of Congress of July 24, 1866, is now under moral obligations to sell its cable and property to the Government at any time at its appraised value, and also that the Postmaster-General has the right annually to fix the rate to be charged for governmental cablegrams transmitted by this cable, and also that governmental messages shall have precedence over other messages in transmission.

I now refer to the conclusions of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce that reported on this subject in the last Congress:

The following disadvantages of a Government cable have occurred to the committee, and in the opinion of the committee they are controlling and justify the conclusions now arrived at:

1. The great first cost of establishing a Government trans-Pacific cable system, that is \$15,000,000.
2. The comparatively great annual cost of a Government cable, estimated at \$1,500,000.
3. The inability of the United States Government to land and operate a government-owned cable either in Japan or China.
4. That as a Government cable would not obtain traffic to and from China and Japan, its income would be limited to traffic to and from the Philippines and Hawaiian Islands, which at an outside estimate would not exceed \$150,000 annually, while the annual expense would be \$1,500,000.
5. That, assuming that a Government cable could reach China and Japan and secure all the business which a private company might develop, still, if the experience of American cable companies in Central and South America is repeated in the Philippines, China, and Japan, as seems probable, 90 per cent of the whole telegraph traffic will be carried on by less than 400 customers, 300 of whom will be foreigners and the balance inhabitants of the United States; so that the proposition to establish a Government cable system would mean a tax amounting to an outlay of \$15,000,000 and a large annual expense for the benefit of only 100 Americans and 300 foreign firms and corporations.

Mr. Chairman, I ask if there is any argument that has been made for and in behalf of the Government building, constructing, and owning this Pacific cable that does not apply with equal force to land transportation, railroads, and to our foreign shipping interests? Why does it not apply?

Now, Mr. Chairman, just in conclusion, as I see my time is about to run out, I desire to read what one of the ablest commercial papers published in this country says about that majority report. I do not mean to reflect upon anybody or on anything, but the Journal of Commerce, published in New York, stands as high with the business interests of this country as any newspaper, magazine, or other publication, I believe, in the country. It is well for this House, when undertaking to engage in a business transaction, to consider these things. Here is a company that offers to build this cable, that has a contract already let for a part of it, and that obligates itself to build it by 1905 without a single dollar of subsidy from the Government.

In the last Congress the proposition was for the Government to pay \$400,000 annually for twenty years. This company now offers to build this cable without any Government subsidy. When you come to look into this matter and see the testimony of Mr. Scrymser you will see where the great Western Union Telegraph Company stands in this transaction. It is here to-day opposing this company, opposing the proposition to let an individual corporation build this line, when in the last Congress it advocated that proposition. What is the cause of the change? I say it is enough to cause us to look into it.

Now, the Journal of Commerce comments upon the majority report upon this bill, which is the report made by my friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CORLISS], who made two speeches



upon this subject before the majority and minority reports were presented to the House. The Journal of Commerce in commenting on this report uses this language:

The majority report of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on the bill providing for Government ownership of the Pacific cable is one of those documents which tend to deepen the conviction that there has of late years been a marked decline in the average intelligence of the popular branch of Congress. It certainly reads like anything but the argument that an intelligent body of men would present on a plain business proposition for the purpose of convincing other men of presumably sound judgment of the propriety of expending a very large amount of public money. It is a curious mixture of pure claptrap, baseless assumption, and bald inaccuracy.

Mr. Chairman, if this bill is passed, I sincerely believe that it will be the stepping-stone to the most comprehensive system of Government monopoly. The most advanced expansionists can scarcely contend for such a measure. It is an old and well-established American doctrine that the Government shall not enter the field of individual enterprise. The protection of our foreign possessions is not so exacting that we should violate this fundamental principle.

Mr. CORLISS says:

How anyone representing the interests of the people can sanction such a scheme by their silence and countenance the compact between these companies is beyond my comprehension.

My reply, Mr. Chairman, to that is that it is more than preposterous to think that any public man or business man would for a moment favor the United States Government laying a cable to compete with a cable which is being manufactured and laid at private expense and without a dollar of subsidy or cost to the Government, and laid by a company competent, skilled, and reputable, and which gives every guaranty that the Government has asked—permits the Government to buy the cable at any time at an appraised value; agrees to build an all-American cable, if possible; to allow Postmaster-General to fix the Government rates; to give priority to Government messages; to allow Secretary of State, when he thinks it is expedient to the public service, to take control of the cable for the use of the Government, or if Secretary of State thinks proper, can order persons to take charge of the transmission of messages; to build the entire line to the Philippines by January 1, 1905. How can a business man ask that the Government build their cable in the face of such propositions from a competent private company?

Mr. Chairman, the comment that I have read from the Journal of Commerce comes from a paper that goes into the banking houses and business offices of the men of this country. It was made upon the report of my friend from Michigan. It speaks plainly and with force on the business aspect of this question.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. HITT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BELLAMY] fifteen minutes.

Mr. BELLAMY. Mr. Chairman, on Monday last this House, by a unanimous vote, passed the bill abolishing the last of the war taxes, which were levied to meet the expenses of the war of humanity which was declared by our Government against Spain to release her tyrannical hand from the throat of prostrate Cuba.

The necessity for the repeal of these war taxes had been long apparent, and this burden on our people ought to have been removed more than two years ago, when the Democratic minority endeavored to abolish them, but were prevented by the majority party in this Chamber.

This action, however, coming as late as it does, is gratifying to the friends of good government, who believe that unnecessary taxation is unjust taxation, and that the accumulation of a large surplus in the Treasury is robbery of the substance of the people and an impoverishment of their condition.

It seems, then, that at last a general feeling of justice and equity is beginning to pervade this Chamber, which I hope will continue, that we may invoke it in behalf of the Cuban people in their appeal to the American Congress.

There is no figure in the present era of our politics who has impressed me more as one who is fearless, honest, and positive, and withal endowed with great individuality, than has our distinguished President, and, while differing with him in many of his views of governmental principles and policies, I cheerfully concede to him these virtues. In his message to Congress in December last he used this language:

I most earnestly ask your attention to the wisdom, indeed, to the vital need, of providing a substantial reduction of the tariff on Cuban imports into the United States.

In enforcing this grave matter upon Congress he but gave emphasis to these characteristics, expression to a wise and statesman-like policy, and to a sentiment that lies deeply embedded in every philanthropic American heart.

These views are entitled to the respectful and serious consideration of this Congress, and should be heeded by the enactment of a law to effect that result.

I wish to thank the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS] for his wise, timely, and patriotic resolution in behalf of Cuba, inviting her to become a part of the American Republic, and to assure him that he has at least my humble aid and support in this commendable measure.

His resolution is as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the President of the United States is hereby authorized to admit Cuban sugars, produced from the present crop, upon the payment of three-fourths of the present duty, in consideration of a reciprocal arrangement upon the part of Cuba, giving to the American products entering Cuba such concessions or preferential duties as he may approve and deem advisable, such arrangement to continue until the 1st day of January, 1903.

SEC. 2. That in the meantime the Republic of Cuba is invited to become a part of the United States of America and her people to become citizens of the United States, with the assurance that Cuba will be entitled at first to a Territorial form of government under the Constitution and laws of the United States, with a Delegate in Congress to represent her people, and that ultimate statehood will be granted when, in the judgment of the Congress of the United States, it is advisable to admit Cuba, including such other West India islands belonging to the United States as may be deemed advisable, as a single State in the Union, to be called the State of Cuba.

It has long been the dream, if not the ardent desire, of the American people that Cuba should some day become an integral part of our Union. Mr. Thomas Jefferson recommended its acquisition early in his first Administration.

During President Polk's Administration our Government offered Spain \$100,000,000 for the islands, but Spain promptly declined the offer.

In 1854 President Pierce, through his Secretary of State, Marcy, appointed Ministers Buchanan, Mason, and Soule, then our representatives at three European courts, to confer with Spain in reference to its acquisition, and these ministers published a manifesto in which they said the Union could never enjoy repose and security "as long as Cuba is not embraced within its boundaries."

The national Democratic convention of 1856, and that also of 1860, both declared in favor of the acquisition of Cuba. It is Democracy, therefore—yes, Jeffersonian Democracy—to advocate the expansion of our Republic, if such expansion extends to the acquisition of contiguous territory, or even territory in close proximity to the American Union.

It is the manifest destiny of this great American Union, this great national Republic, to expand its territorial borders, and in the course of time to embrace within its limits the Dominion of Canada and the Republic of Mexico, and to become a great North American Republic, ruling the people who inhabit it with those principles embodied in that form of government first promulgated to the world in the written Constitution of the United States. And it is a fervent wish in which I may be pardoned for indulging that I may live to see the day when by peaceable and honorable means not only those two great countries, but Cuba as well, may be merged into our Union under the same flag and the same Constitution which is now the emblem of our nationality and the chart of our powers.

How can we bring about these ends? Not by hostile tariff laws, which already have alienated many of the best people of Canada, who have fondly cherished the idea of annexation to this Republic, but by cultivating the most equitable reciprocal trade relations as to those articles she produces that would not cripple or injure any existing industries of our country and by encouraging the most friendly social intercourse, which will ultimately weld together the two countries by such ties as to make it to the interest and policy of that great Dominion to knock for admission to our Union, that they may also share the advantages of a republic which develops not only the most magnificent citizenship, but also the most splendid material and industrial civilization that the genius of man has ever evolved.

Many annexationists have boldly proclaimed that the Teller resolution passed at the time of the declaration of the war against Spain—

That the United States disclaims any disposition or intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction, or control over said island except for the pacification thereof, and asserts its determination, when that is accomplished, to leave the government and control of the island to its people—

and that the war was declared to stop the inhuman and brutal practices of Spain toward those people, was not only a mistake, but a blunder. I do not so regard it. There is honor among nations as among individuals, and no other declaration and no other motive would have justified, at the time, this Government, either among the nations of the world or in the eyes of our own Christian people in this era of the world's civilization, in sacrificing the blood and property of this nation, which was offered up on the altar of humanity.

That resolution was the expression of a policy long adopted by this nation in its relations with the other powers of the world, which has ever made it the beacon light to lead on all struggling peoples, which have been restless for liberty and which has made this Republic leap forward in its progress as a nation, and attracted to its shores much of the splendid manhood and talent of



the world, who have made it their home and contributed toward making it the richest and most powerful of all nations.

By the destiny of war Porto Rico has become a part of our territory. The Danish West Indies have been purchased within the last few days, and Cuba, the gem of the Antilles, stands at our threshold.

Cuba occupies to-day a most singular attitude toward this Republic. Geographically it is but a prolongation of the Florida coast, which in some remote age was cut off from the mainland by volcanic upheaval or depression. Certain it is that its proximity to our territory makes it a most valuable and desirable acquisition.

It has, by its last census, 1,572,000 people. It has rich soil and pleasant climate.

Her chief products are sugar, tobacco, fruits, hard woods, and minerals, which she exports, while her purchases are rice, cotton goods, boots and shoes, paper, machinery, crockery, glassware, furniture, and wood manufactures.

In her present depressed and impoverished condition she buys of other nations annually about—

Rice	\$4,000,000
Low-class wines	4,000,000
Metals and machinery	5,000,000
Cotton goods	7,000,000
Boots and shoes	400,000
Crockery and glassware	7,000,000
Furniture and woodwork	3,000,000
Total	\$4,000,000

Besides this she purchases many millions of dollars worth of food products. Her purchases for 1891 amounted to \$66,000,000. Much the larger portion of all her purchases of manufactured products are obtained from Europe, when reciprocal trade relations at the present time would enable our factories and people to sell them at least 90 per cent of all these purchases, and final annexation will practically secure it all.

And why should we not induce Cuba to enter our ports on terms more advantageous to both countries? Will it injure seriously or in any degree any existing industry of this nation?

It has been claimed by only two industries—that of beet sugar and the cigar manufacturer—that they would be affected.

Let us examine these claims. In reference to the sugar-beet industry we see that for the year 1901 the entire amount of sugar consumed in the United States was 2,372,316 tons.

The entire product of the sugar producer for 1901 was from—

	Tons.
Louisiana	300,000
Hawaii	320,000
Porto Rico	120,000
American beet sugar	150,000

Making a total of 890,000

which still left a shortage in American consumption for said year of 1,482,316 tons. Cuba's sugar product estimated for 1901-2 is 800,000 tons. If the whole of her product were allowed to come in free, there would still be a shortage in the American demand of 682,316 tons, which we would still have to import from other nations of the world; and yet the beet-sugar trust is not willing to allow the people of the United States to be generous to a nation whose good will we wish to hold and which is virtually asking to be admitted into our Union as a part of our territory!

In the matter of the cigar makers' claim, I have this to say: The quality of tobacco which Cuba produces and manufactures does not seriously come in competition with the American product. But few States in the Union cultivate tobacco for cigar purposes. Neither Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Alabama, Mississippi, or Louisiana cultivate it at all for that purpose, while Ohio, Connecticut, Wisconsin, Pennsylvania, New York, Massachusetts, and Florida to a very limited extent!

And even in Cuba her exports of cigars to the United States has fallen off from 1889 to the year 1900 of nearly 62 per cent; last year even less. In 1900 Cuba only exported to the United States three-fourths of 1 per cent of all the cigars consumed in this country. Even if Cuba should be encouraged to aspire to producing 2 per cent of the American cigar consumption she would have to double her present output, which she could not do, because of the recognized fact that she has not the land adapted to the growth of tobacco suitable to our market.

Why, then, is it not good business policy to reduce the tariff on sugar and cigars 40 per cent of the present rates for a corresponding reduction of the Cuban tariff on cotton goods, rice, furniture, woodwork, boots and shoes, machinery, glass and crockery ware?

This is a matter not only of general good to the people of all sections of our country, but especially so to the section which I represent.

Cotton manufactures are growing at a very rapid rate in the States of North and South Carolina and Georgia.

In the census returns for 1900, North Carolina has advanced

ahead of all the States of the Union in the number of cotton-manufacturing establishments.

	Mills.
North Carolina	177
Massachusetts	163
Pennsylvania	150
South Carolina	80
Rhode Island	71
Georgia	67

While in the capital invested Massachusetts stands first, South Carolina, Rhode Island, and North Carolina follow in successive order. In North Carolina, in 1900, 30,273 persons were employed in these mills, while 30,201 were employed in South Carolina, and 18,283 in Georgia.

In North Carolina, in 1901, \$17,886,624 of material was used, and in South Carolina \$17,263,882, and \$11,113,356 in Georgia. In the last two years the cotton-mill industry has been much depressed and many mills have been run at a loss. It is estimated that with proper reciprocal arrangements the cotton-goods trade alone could be increased to \$13,000,000 a year when that country is permitted to make a living price on sugar and tobacco, which to-day, on account of the high tariff, we are reliably informed, is raised and sold at a loss and her people unable to buy our products.

There is another consideration which makes the residents of the Atlantic seaboard look with favor upon the problem of annexation: Situated so close to our doors, with a rich soil and luxurious vegetation under a semitropical sun, Cuba has been for generations past a breeding spot for that most virulent and fatal of all pests, yellow fever. We have seen our seaport towns, in years gone by, swept by epidemics of this dreadful disease, brought from Cuba, with such violence that our towns were almost depopulated. It took years to recover from the demoralization and loss, both to life and property, and yet each recurring season they stood in awe of another visitation.

Norfolk and Wilmington, Charleston and Savannah, New Orleans and Mobile, and Galveston all felt the scourge of this dreadful plague.

Modern hygienic measures have demonstrated not only that this disease can be checked, but can be eradicated by proper sanitary precautions.

The welfare of the great eastern section from Maine to Texas would be secured if the Government of the United States owned this territory and could put into practical execution all of its laws and rules of sanitation to the same extent and as fully as it could or would do were Cuba a part of our territory and our governmental regulations at all times in force there.

But apart from a business and sordid consideration, that humanity which we so much and so wisely respected, and which prompted us to declare war against Spain, now urgently demands that the United States, which has its army in the island, and which has forced Cuba to yield her assent to the eight provisions of the Platt amendment—that she should not enter into a treaty with a foreign power, allowing such power to obtain lodgment in or control of any portion of her territory; that she shall not contract a debt beyond the ability of the island to pay; that this Government may intervene at any time it deems proper to protect life, liberty, or property; that this Government shall have a voice in the sanitary plans of the island, and that Cuba will cede to us territory for coaling stations and dockyards, and shall not include the Isle of Pines in the government—demands now, as we virtually exercise a protectorate, that we give her the relief for which she prays.

President-elect Palma, of the Cuban Republic, tells us that unless we reduce the tariff on sugar the planter can not make any profit whatever, and he can not continue in business, and—

as a consequence 500,000 persons will be practically without means of subsistence. Anarchy will reign in the island instead of law and order, and you will not only have to send more troops there, perhaps, but will surely be sending us food, that we may not die of famine.

And to the same effect is the report of our representative in Cuba, General Wood, who forcibly says:

Each day of delay in giving relief is dangerous. When once the crash comes relief will be of little value, except to the speculator, who may gather up the wrecks here. The people of the country, who have virtually reconstructed it in three years, will be ruined, and we shall have to step in and re-occupy the country or continue in occupation and do over again the work which we have spent thousands of lives and much treasure in doing up to date.

This information, coming as it does from the representatives of the two governments, with daily appeals from the commercial bodies of Cuba and many of her prominent citizens to the members of this House, is a warning which this Government can not disregard.

On comparison with the Philippine possessions Cuba is a far more desirable acquisition. I can not better draw the comparison than by quoting a part of an article in the Habana Post of November 10, 1901, where the editor says:

All of the Philippines, for example, import less than Habana does, although the population of Manila and Habana are practically the same.



Manila contains more than 50,000 Chinamen and Habana fewer than 8,000. Manila holds more than 180,000 native Filipinos and Habana fewer than 30,000 negroes; Manila has fewer than 11,000 whites, including 8,500 Americans, while Habana is controlled by 116,000 native whites, assisted by 53,000 whites of foreign birth. This tells the story. The situation in Hawaii is little if any better than in the Philippines. Porto Rico is stifled by an excessive population, negro and mixed, and holds no promise for development.

Outside of the towns, both in the Hawaiian and the Philippine islands, the barbarian holds sway. Life is not safe, and agriculture must be carried on under the protection of armed men. Outside of the cities and towns of Cuba human life is as safe as within the towns, and as safe as in Ohio or Pennsylvania. Here are millions of acres awaiting occupation and culture, and the immigrant can squat as safely in Santiago as he could fifty years ago in Nebraska.

The conditions are entirely different in Cuba from those of the other islands named. There are more white persons in Cuba than in the Philippines, Sandwich Islands, Porto Rico, Java, Trinidad, Barbadoes, Bermuda, and British Guiana together. There are more evidences of wealth and civilization in this island than in all the others united. The United States can sell more goods to this island two years from now, under proper trade arrangements, than that country will be selling to all of the others. More Americans will come to Cuba under such trade arrangements than will go to all the other areas named. With fair trade relations, this island would become Americanized long before the American armies can be withdrawn from the Philippines.

Already this Government has expended \$300,000,000 for the subjugation of the Philippine Islands, and it is costing us \$12,000,000 a month to further pacify them. So long as we keep these Asiatics they will be a source of irritation and expense to our country. Spain has given us the veritable shirt of Nessus, and the more we try to solve the expensive problem of pacification by arms the more we will tear the very flesh from our vitals. Let our Government promptly adopt the affirmative policy now outlined by the Democratic party in the Senate, which is:

(1) That the United States relinquish all claim to sovereignty over the Philippines, "subject to the provisions hereinafter set forth."

(2) That from and after the passage of this act the Philippine Islands shall be foreign territory, and all goods entering the United States therefrom shall be subject to the same duties, customs, and imposts as are now or may be hereafter prescribed by law for goods entered from other foreign countries: *Provided*, That during the temporary occupation of the islands all trade between them and the United States shall be free.

(3) That the United States shall continue to occupy the archipelago until the Filipinos have formed for themselves a stable government, and until sufficient guarantees have been obtained for the performance of our treaty obligations with Spain, and for the safety of those inhabitants who have adhered to the United States.

(4) That as soon as these results have been accomplished it is declared to be the purpose of the United States to withdraw from the Philippines and leave the government, control, and sovereignty thereof to the inhabitants, retaining only such military, naval, and coaling stations as may be designated by the Government of the United States.

If we can then free ourselves by this means of the Philippine blunder and confine our territorial acquisitions to the American continent, the United States of America will become the leading factor in the world's civilization. Our Army, which, if large, may become, as the founders said, "the engine of despotism," may be kept at a minimum and not be a burden to the people; our Navy should be increased to keep pace with our constantly increasing commerce, and will be able to protect American interests in all quarters of the globe. If, then, by generous treatment we can further gain the good will of Cuba, and by the passage of the Newlands resolution invite her to apply for annexation, the "Gem of the Antilles" will add much to the wealth of our nation. She will become a valuable strategic point, as she is now a natural military outpost for our Government, which, if not secured, may, in the not distant future, be used to the great detriment of this country in time of war.

Let us all be true and cling with confidence to the traditions of the fathers.

Let us avoid entangling alliances and develop our Republic on the Western Hemisphere.

Let us preserve and defend the Monroe doctrine.

Let us extend our trade by the principles of amity and fair dealing.

Our people will then be prosperous and happy. The American name will be revered throughout the world as the synonym of honor, chivalry, and progress. Wars will not be known, and peace and plenty will prevail throughout the land.

Peace! And no longer from its brazen portals  
The blast of war's great organ shakes the skies;  
But beautiful as the songs of the immortals  
The holy melodies of love arise.

[Loud applause.]

Mr. HITT. I yield fifteen minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREEN].

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the passage of the bill under consideration means that for another year after the close of the present fiscal year this country is pledged to a continuance of the present inefficient consular system.

Viewed from a commercial standpoint there is no branch of this Government so much in need of immediate reform as the consular service. We have reached the time when this country has become a great exporting nation. Whether we shall hold our own and increase our foreign markets largely depends upon the efficiency of this service. That will be a more potent factor in

the development of our trade relations with foreign nations than any ship-subsidy bill that can be enacted into law.

I had hoped that before the present bill would be presented for our consideration a bill effecting radical changes in this service on business lines would be passed. When I vote for this bill it will be only because a continuance of the present service is better than none at all.

My plea is for a complete reorganization of this important branch of the public service.

Pending that, I urge two important reforms which are possible and most urgent, one, at least, of which can be made by amendment of the present bill.

The first is the selection of more efficient men to fill the consularships in important commercial ports, or ports which can be made important.

Second. Adequate pay for our representatives, especially at these ports.

An examination of the great commercial routes of the world will show that shipping from all the export ports of the eastern and western Atlantic converges at the entrance of the Mediterranean Sea. It then sails east, some stopping at the ports of southern Europe and northern Africa, but the main body pass through the Suez Canal and visit Arabia, Egypt, the seaport towns of eastern Africa, or those of southern Asia, until Singapore is reached. Here it diverges, going northward to Manila, Hongkong, and the commercial ports of eastern Asia and Japan, and southward through the East Indies until they touch the ports of far-off Australia and the islands of Oceania.

To the American, English, German, and French manufacturers—and these are the four greatest manufacturing nations—this commercial route takes a very considerable part of the manufactured goods they export, and through it returns all the merchandise returned in exchange for the outgoing cargoes.

One would naturally suppose that at every port of general rendezvous or importance along that great artery of commercial travel this country would be represented by a capable, active, aggressive, industrious business man—a real American hustler—who not only examines the situations as disclosed at his port daily, keeping up with the news as told by the trading vessels coming and going, locating the localities where goods were being carried, as well as the return cargoes, watching demand and supply, alert to find an opportunity for a new market or the extension of an existing one. Is this the case?

It happened to be my privilege last summer to pass over this great commercial route, stopping at Gibraltar, where all that vast volume of shipping going to the Orient stops and stops again returning, visiting the ports of Malta, Port Said, Suez, Aden, Ceylon, Singapore, Manila, Hongkong, Shanghai, Nagasaki, Kobe, and Yokohama.

All along the route I gave attention to the matter of American consuls and met and conversed with many of them. Time and time again the utter inefficiency and sometimes the absolute worthlessness of the present service at these important ports was impressed upon me. I do not hesitate to say that I believe the great mercantile firm of Marshall Field & Co., of Chicago, told nothing but the plain, unvarnished truth when they said:

There is no branch of the service more in need of reform. So far as the importing business is concerned, our consuls, with some few exceptions, are worthless, and if we hope to secure for our manufacturers a full share of foreign trade the necessity for improvement in the service is apparent. It seems to me that this country should be intelligently and creditably represented abroad.

Any traveler who has the power of observation to a slight degree, when his attention is called to our service, must admit that only too often our consuls are worthless. One would naturally suppose that along the important commercial pathway which I have mentioned we would have our best men. If that is the case, I would like to see the worst.

It is fair at least to consider those located at the ports I visited as fair specimens of what I would find along other important commercial routes.

With these as examples I cry out loudly for reform. The increase of our foreign markets has been largely due to the individual enterprise of our manufacturing companies, and they have received little or no assistance from our consular agents. They have paid their own bills, and the expense of establishing a foreign market for any manufactured article is enormous and the risk great.

They are entitled to have such assistance as this Government can furnish them with through the most expert and energetic officials.

They have no such assistance if the ports I have visited are fair examples.

At Gibraltar, which by reason of its location ought to be one of the most important of our consular stations, what have we there? A miserable \$1,500 position, with a consul who certainly does not earn by his work a larger sum.



When I was at Gibraltar during the past year, the consul had recently died, and his son was taking his place, and, if I remember rightly, his son had never seen America. The father had been there for many years. The fact was that the service at an important point like that was in the hands of a man who knew little or nothing of America. He had no occasion to speak any foreign language particularly, because the English language is current there, so that that was no excuse for having a foreigner there or a man who was equivalent to a foreigner.

Here, at that important point, at the gateway of that great highway of commerce, we have a \$1,500 consulate, and the result is a \$1,500 man. I say, if we want to improve this service we could start right at this point and make that consular station a position commensurate with the importance of the place, and then fill it by putting a live, hustling, American business man there.

I am satisfied there are opportunities for extending our markets all over this portion of the world, in Africa, in Spain, and many other places where proper consular officials could give us important information, through the opportunities afforded by the shipping coming through this port. At Malta, in my opinion, we have one of the most active men I have met in the service. Instead of giving him the miserable \$2,000, give him better pay, for he spends the greater portion of his salary in pushing our business interests. This pushing, energetic man we should give a liberal salary, so that he should be able to meet half way the people from whom you are trying to obtain business.

We all know in business it takes money to extend trade. To say the least, our consuls must meet men and entertain them constantly; mix with them and be the polite good fellow among them. A consul receiving \$1,500 or \$2,000 a year must do this out of his own pocket. In these seaports along the principal commercial routes there should be a contingent fund in the consul's control, under fair limitations, by which he can meet contingencies as they occur. I am satisfied that the work of first-rate men at Gibraltar, Malta, and Port Said, where we do not have a consulate, only an agent, would pay the expense of the whole consular service in the East. Here are three important places—Gibraltar, Malta, and Port Said—through which the shipping of the Orient passes. Active men at these places could keep tab on all that takes place in the Eastern commercial world.

They could give our Government information and suggestions which would do more to extend our commerce than any subsidy bill. And if we would follow out that with an active man in Ceylon, and an able representative at Singapore, we would do much to improve the service in that part of the world. The representative at Colombo is not at all fitted for the place he holds. When we arrived there few of us were able to find our consul. He did not seem to think it was worth while to come on board a United States transport or even inquire whether he could be of any service to representatives of his country.

A man with less ambition I never met in the service; and from all I could find out about him from the active business men I met in that city he seemed to hold himself aloof from the business community and associates with himself, mixing with the merchants and planters and American visitors only as much as it was absolutely necessary to attend to routine work. He seemed to have no friends, and every one I met spoke slightly of him.

That is not the kind of man to press American commerce; not the kind of man to increase our markets. At this port is a place for a good, active consul. The tea industries of Ceylon are increasing. Ceylon is intimately connected with the trade of British India. If there is a place in all that section that could be picked, outside of the port of Singapore, it is Ceylon, where a good, active business man could show results.

Singapore is the port where all the commerce of Australia and eastern Asia concentrates. It is the great trading mart and transshipment port of the Orient. I admit the commerce there is in the hands of the Chinese merchants. It would be hard for you to buy or sell a thousand dollars' worth of goods at that port without their going through the hands of the Chinese merchants.

At that port I found a sharp contrast between the active, efficient business man employed by the American Tobacco Company to manage and care for that company's interests in that part of the world and the American consul. The American consul perfunctorily does his business, and he receives \$3,000 compensation for it.

If we had a representative like the American Tobacco Company there I am satisfied it would show results which increased business and such practical results as our manufacturing communities trading there have the right to expect. We may talk as we please about maintaining a great "open door" in the East. We may ask an "open door" in China; but, gentlemen, with "open doors" we must have the right kind of doorkeepers. That is what we must have there if we would develop the trade of our country and reap the great advantages of that immense volume of trade which it is claimed we can develop there.

Mr. CLARK. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK. What scheme have you got that will give us better consuls? This committee has wrestled with that proposition a good long time.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. You could not have done much worse than you have.

Mr. CLARK. Our evidence is that the American consular service is as good as anybody else's.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. That is a mistake.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. That is an absolute mistake. I will answer that by saying that if you will pay adequate salaries I think you will get better consuls.

Mr. CLARK. But the question I would like to ask you is as to whether a committee or an individual upon the floor of the House would know best about that. This Committee on Foreign Affairs has wrestled with the proposition a good deal and we have had these civil-service reformers up there; my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. ADAMS] has his scheme; and I would ask the gentleman if he has something practical in the way of getting better consuls.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. I should have thought the Committee on Foreign Affairs, who have that matter in charge, and who would be acquainted with the details particularly must have studied the question, and I certainly thought they were able to devise some scheme. Pick your men who are business men in this country and who are accustomed to handle the goods that go through the market and give them a sufficient salary. Instead of giving them \$1,500 give them \$5,000 or \$10,000, and you will bring into the positions a class of men that will be useful to you. What is the use of maintaining a consular service for the sake of calling it a consular service? If you want to get a good service, you must pay for it. That is the rule in this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I would like a few minutes more.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be allowed five minutes.

Mr. HITT. I ask unanimous consent that the time for closing general debate be postponed five minutes, and I will yield it to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I would like five minutes to reply to the gentleman from Pennsylvania if I consent that he shall have five minutes more. Is there any objection to that?

Mr. HITT. Three other gentlemen have asked the same thing.

Mr. HILL. Then I guess that will be reply enough, and I withdraw my request. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks that the time of the general debate be postponed five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HITT. I will yield that five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I can not say that I have examined or have sufficient information on this question of the consular service. I make this as a fair criticism from matters that have been brought to my personal attention, matters that I could not help examining, circumstances that were so thrust upon my attention that I could not help taking notice of them.

Knowing the demand of this country, knowing the opinion of men who have manufactured goods to export, knowing that they believe that we could expand to a large extent our foreign markets if they had such assistance as the Government ought to furnish them, I came here to tell you what I know, what I saw, and to plead with you to find some way in which the consular service could be reformed.

I believe that in reforming you will bring good men into the service and pay them an adequate salary. If a fund for them which they could use in an emergency could be established, and in addition to that you should inspect the consulates and keep men going around to give you the latest news from the consular ports, it would be a great benefit to the service. If you should cover this ground, you will do a great deal to reform the service and make it as practical as you can do it without absolutely reforming it.

I do not believe so much will be accomplished in a short time by civil-service rules, but I do believe that wherever there are assistants you should put them under the civil-service rules and give them a chance by promotion to take the important places as they become fitted for them. The inspectors will soon tell you who are fit men and who are not, especially if the inspector is a fair man and has the interest of the Government and the interest of the people who manufacture goods in this country at heart.

Mr. KLUTTZ. May I ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania a question?



Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Certainly.

Mr. KLUTTZ. Is the gentleman from Pennsylvania in favor of putting the consular service under the civil-service rules?

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. To some extent I am. I believe you can do it to a considerable extent if you make the examinations sensible and practical. I do not mean one that a school-teacher only could pass, but to examine a man and see whether he has got hustle and push, business knowledge and address that will make him efficient in a place of that kind.

Mr. HITT. I now yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR].

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, there is nothing easier in this world than to complain and growl. I have listened on the floor of this House a great many years to an annual recurrence of the bitter criticism made upon the corps of consular representatives of the United States abroad. In 1891 I had occasion to hold either personal or written communication with each one of them, and since that time I have visited and seen a majority of them. I undertake to say, what I have said on this floor before, and which general statement will not be contradicted, that the consular service of the United States is far better, in all respects and in every respect, than is the consular service of any nation in the world. [Applause.]

I pointed out that in the European system every one of the propositions in what is called the reform movement in the consular service of the United States is involved. Long terms of service, training for the particular place, rigid and active examinations under various civil-service organizations, and all that, and yet I repeat now what our ambassador to France told me less than a year and a half ago, of his own motion, that it was conceded by every ambassador and minister at the court of Paris that our system and our representatives were by far the most efficient in all Europe. [Applause.] He told me further than that, that upon the recurrence of each one of our consular reports being printed and sent to the ambassador in Paris that the representatives of foreign governments always came to him and in a complimentary manner said: "Your system, your men, are so far superior to ours that we frankly come and say so to you and ask you for the information which they have furnished."

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. GROSVENOR. No; I can not yield. I could give names if it were proper. I will refer to one or two. They talk about the length of service. There is a consul-general at Berlin to-day who was appointed in the consular service in 1877—a man of fine education before he went abroad and who has acquired a splendid knowledge of the languages of those countries. He, with another consul-general, has charge of all the consulates in the great Empire of Germany. I say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that I can take a list of the names of those consuls and read them to the House and point out that there is no better-educated class of men anywhere—no more efficient, valuable, sterling men. They are not hustlers. They would not do to handle a ready-made clothing store, I presume. There are many of them doubtless who would not be efficient in the character of the "auctioneer" in the famous play that is being performed throughout this country.

I do not think they would understand all about the question of high prices in one instance and low prices in another. But they are gentlemen who have studied the system of trade; and the reports which they send to this country from the different towns at which they are stationed should put the blush of shame upon men who are constantly deriding the institutions of our country. Take our consular reports from Glasgow, from Edinburgh, from Manchester, from Birmingham, from Huddersfield, from any of the points in the United Kingdom. Take the reports from the different consular stations in Germany or from St. Gall or elsewhere over the Continent of Europe, and tell me what is there lacking in those reports in the matter of education and intelligence and clearness of statement. I say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania—and I stand here to challenge contradiction of the statement—that our consuls are an educated, efficient, and highly valuable organization of men. You can not have a permanent—

Mr. DOUGLAS. If those men are so efficient as the gentleman says they are—and I do not agree with him on that point—should they not be paid better salaries? And I should like to ask, also, whether some of our consuls are not resigning constantly because upon the compensation allowed they can not support themselves?

Mr. GROSVENOR. The gentleman is making a speech in my time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I beg the gentleman's pardon, but—

Mr. GROSVENOR. I decline to be interrupted in any such unfair manner.

Now, what I was about to say, Mr. Chairman, was this: We

can not have long-continued service by these consuls upon the pay we are giving them. And let me say, very few of them are resigning. I have examined with some care and ascertained what happens at the consulates in Europe and in Asia. Some consuls are resigning, it is true, but I have never yet known one of those places to be vacant very many hours. There are always 25 or 30 applications for one vacancy. And if the gentleman has any friend who is an applicant for such a position he will have to be very alert in going to the State Department in behalf of the applicant, so as to know at once when a vacancy happens, for otherwise he will not have a chance to get his man in. We can not keep men in those positions for long terms, and I do not believe, as a rule, it is desirable that we should.

Mr. HILL. There is no nation that does keep its men long in such service.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Certainly; that is the fact. The experience of mankind has been against long-continued terms of consuls. [Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. HITT. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GAINES].

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I had somewhat of an experience last summer in regard to our consuls. I did not hear all of the remarks of my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREEN], but I did hear the question put to him by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], who asked him in effect how he would improve the consular service. Allow me to say to the House that I think the personnel of this service at some places should be improved.

I think we should have better men at certain places. We should have men in this service who are consuls only, and not consuls incidentally and merchants or agents of American and other firms as a daily and regular business. It seems to me that our consuls should be consuls and capable of being so, and nothing else.

The service between New York and the Philippine Islands by way of the Suez Canal is not what it should be, because some of the officers are not fit for the place in any respect. There are some notable exceptions.

If we can not improve this service by getting better men at the salaries now paid, then I say we should increase the salaries, if money will enable us to get the men who should represent us at these places. We should not pay the "poor little pittances," as some of them said, now allowed, and then turn these officers loose upon the community to make up what should be paid them by the Government by selling goods on a commission or otherwise.

I remember distinctly that the most importunate appeals were made to me, and if I mistake not to other members of our Congressional party, and those appeals consisted in this: "For Heaven's sake raise our salaries; we can not live here scarcely on the salary we are paid and attend to our business as we should." Now, Mr. Chairman, I am an American. I dislike to criticize any man who is an American, and I am talking not so much about the law as the men who are executing the law as it is. I speak of what I happened to know, and I feel Congress should know. We have to be cruel to be kind sometimes.

Mr. LANDIS. Will the gentleman yield to a question?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I should like to yield, but I think my time is up.

Mr. LANDIS. The gentleman speaks of the importunate appeals for increase of salary.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. LANDIS. I would like to ask if the gentleman knows of anyone in the Government service, excepting Senators and Representatives, who are not importunately demanding an increase of salary?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Do you object to increasing the salaries of the judges of our Supreme Court? I am not for increasing their salaries, I will tell you. There are other people in this country who are in a state of penury to-day who have no salary and no money, and in need of the every-day necessities of life, who are appealing to this Congress year after year, and have for forty years, asking that this Government pay them their just claims, and yet we turn them away with a deaf ear and a cold hand. I am opposed to that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HITT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FEELY] for ten minutes.

Mr. FEELY. Mr. Chairman, in expressing my belief that the time is ripe for the improvement of the consular system, I desire not to cast any reflections on the service of the United States, as the distinguished gentleman from Ohio would have us believe anyone would do who would insist upon an improvement of the system. I desire to call attention to the fact that the business interests of the United States are daily petitioning members of this House for an examination into and a report upon the question of the improvement of the system. I can not in the few minutes allotted



me discuss to any considerable extent, or formulate even the outlines of any definite plan, as is thought necessary to be done by the gentleman from Missouri before the first word can be said on this subject; but I insist that the time is now here when the members of this House and the Senate must take up this question of the improvement of the consular service. And they must answer the question of the gentleman from Missouri: Shall we place the consulate under civil service?

I do not know that the Democratic party, as a whole, is committed to the principle of civil service—and I know there are men in it who are even as insistently opposed to the principle of civil-service reform as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR]—but I for one say that if the standard of this service can be raised, if the personnel of the consular system can be improved by providing for a definite tenure of office longer than four years for the consuls and attachés, then we ought at least to favor civil-service rules in this respect. I am not afraid of a system because it may attract the opposition of some. We are now in an age when we must move forward or move backward. I do not believe that the war of 1898 marked the beginning of this country as a world power. The brain of the American, the brawn of the American, the best that is in the American character, inherited from all the nations of the earth and welded together to constitute a liberal man with unity of purpose and great patriotism, applying his powers to the development of this country and to the development of its trade, have done more to make this country respected as a world power than all the wars, than all the attempts at civilizing and assimilating foreign people than has ever been done since we went into this colonization and assimilation business.

Mr. CLARK. Will you permit me to ask you a question?

Mr. FEELY. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK. Have you any practical suggestion to make as to how to get a better consulate service? If you have, let us have it, because the Foreign Affairs Committee, of which I am one of the members, has spent a great deal of time wrestling with this very proposition.

Mr. FEELY. And has confessedly failed.

Mr. CLARK. Why, yes; confessedly failed, as the House will confessedly fail—

Mr. FEELY. The gentleman is indulging in mere prediction when he says that the House will fail.

Mr. CLARK. The House, on an average, is of no higher intelligence than the Foreign Affairs Committee, I will undertake to say, without any fear of contradiction. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. FEELY. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK. Here is what I want my friends from Chicago and Tennessee and Pennsylvania and the rest of them to do. The Foreign Affairs Committee is just as anxious as anybody else to improve this consular service, but it will do no good and it is of no purpose to stand here and inveigh against it. That does not accomplish anything. If you have any practical suggestion to make, make it, and we will take it into consideration.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. By removing some of them and putting better men in their places.

Mr. FEELY. I would suggest to the gentleman from Missouri—and I am not at all concerned as to whether or not the House or the gentleman from Missouri or the Committee on Foreign Affairs itself thinks this a ludicrous suggestion—but I would submit that if we have a plan here to educate and develop good diplomats, as we have had a successful plan to educate and develop good soldiers for the land and on the sea, we would be making one step forward in your investigation as to what may be done to elevate the personnel and the whole system of our consular service. I do not see how a man taken from some backwoods county, with no training and no business experience, and appointed because he was useful in delivering a certain number of delegates in that county, can be as good a representative of our country in a busy foreign port as a man who has been educated along the lines of the service as we educate our soldiers and our naval officers.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. FEELY. Certainly.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Do you see how it is possible for a man from a backwoods county to make a good soldier?

Mr. FEELY. I certainly do, if he is trained for it; but I see how it has been impossible in the history of this country, in many instances, to take an untrained civilian and place him at the head of a body of soldiers and get anything like satisfactory results from his activity.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Is it not a fact that some of the best soldiers of whom our country can boast, and indeed that the

strong military arm of this Government is found in the volunteers who have never had any training?

Mr. FEELY. Oh, I have as much respect for the volunteer as the gentleman from Michigan, but I submit that a volunteer never won a victory—a captain's victory, if you choose to call it that—on the day or in the year when he was first commissioned as an officer to guide soldiers in the wars of this country. I have as much respect for the volunteer as the gentleman from Michigan or any other man on the floor of this House, but I submit that if I were to volunteer to-morrow I should want, as the President of the United States wanted in 1898, to fall in line behind a trained officer of this Government. The unsuccessful competitor in the last Presidential race and the present President of the United States are examples of tribute paid to learning and to development, and military practice. The volunteer of to-day is not an untrained soldier ordinarily. He has seen years of service and practice and training in the National Guard of his State and he knows the rules and how to fight so well that he generally wants to fight under officers whose experience have been varied and training rigid.

Mr. KLUTTZ. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FEELY. Yes.

Mr. KLUTTZ. How would the gentlemen select his volunteers for education by the Government?

Mr. FEELY. Oh, they might be selected along the lines that you select the volunteer from your district for appointment to West Point or Annapolis. Exactly the same way. The educated man who is ambitious soon learns business methods. I believe that the United States can not secure, for the paltry sum that it pays, the services of the kind of men whom it should have and whom it is entitled to in this service.

You all know that the great business interests of this country have their own representatives in many of these ports, because they can not rely on the men sent there by the United States under our present system. The Committee on Foreign Affairs ought to be able to do something about it, and I do not admit that that committee has confessed its inability to frame a system for the betterment of this service. If they are so confessedly unable, it might be well, in the face of all this clamor for a betterment of the service, to have public hearings and let suggestions be made by other members of the House and by the various importing and exporting interests, who are so deeply and directly interested in such matters. At any rate, the complaint is quite general, and we could then see upon what basis of reason this complaint rests. We should have the best. We should be willing to pay for it. We should not be unwilling to hear in every particular where we are weak. It is no easier to inveigh against this service than it is to bombastically declare that it is the best service in the world. Such talk will serve no purpose. We want not to declare the belief, but to know the fact.

Mr. DINSMORE. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. FEELY. I do.

Mr. DINSMORE. I should like to ask the gentleman for some suggestion of some line upon which the consular service is to be improved. I should like to have the gentleman specify in what way we may improve this service. We all admit that it ought to be improved, as other branches of the Government ought to be improved, but I should like to know what suggestion the gentleman has to make in that direction.

Mr. FEELY. In the first place, I should improve the service by improving the personnel. Competent men should fill the places. The positions should not be used to pay doubtful political obligations.

Mr. DINSMORE. How would you go about that?

A MEMBER. Elect a Democratic President! [Laughter.]

Mr. FEELY. I do not know that I would do it wholly by electing a Democratic President. I do not assume that in general the appointments made under a Democratic President have been any better than those under a Republican President; but I would raise the salaries; I would assure to the man who goes into that service a livelihood for a certain term of years, at any rate, and if he tired of the position, as suggested by the gentleman from Ohio, I would transfer him to some other post where his usefulness might be demonstrated to the country at large. Men accept these positions with the paltry salary attached for one of three reasons. Either they have despaired of making as much in ordinary business activity, or they desire to be educated at the public expense, with a view of proffering their services to trading concerns at the end of their service, or they are of the globe-trotting class, referred to by certain members, whose only desire is to travel and idly disport themselves, clad in the vestments of the authority of this great Government. They, in the most part, are of these three classes. This should not be. Our Government is too great for



this. The standard should be high, the positions should be of such a standard that honor will attract, and the compensation should be such that those who accept them can live in respectability and in dignity compatible with the requirements of the country.

Let us endeavor to build up a system which will attract more than derelict politicians, pulpless ministers, and lady-like gentlemen.

The whole system of the appointment of our consular officials is defective. The manner of appointment has been a byword, not only throughout the country, where criticism is general, but here in the capital, where it is regarded as part of the pleasures which brighten official life.

It is vouched for by members of this House that on the incoming of a certain Administration the Executive sent to the Senate for confirmation the name of a gentleman from a certain State. Both of the Senators from that State approached each other, and out of their mouths came the same query, "Who in the Lord Harry is Smith?" and they immediately went to the White House and demanded to know why the President appointed such an individual to such an important post. The President, with the imperturbability which was one of his characteristics, reached into a pigeonhole and got the application of the gentleman who had been appointed and, lo and behold, beneath the gentleman's application there was the indorsement and signature of both the indignant Senators. The appointment was made, and it was the duty and pleasure of the two Senators to move the confirmation of the gentleman whom they did not know and of whom they had never heard. This is only one instance, and that there are many such no one will gainsay.

At the beginning of each Administration a great many of the faithful come to this Mecca to receive their reward, following the wise injunction to aim for heaven that they may at least reach purgatory, and that they may receive the reward for which their conception of their ability warrant them in aspiring. The good places are rapidly filled, and they are told daily that they will receive "something equally as good." Then they become as ubiquitous as they are anxious. They meet their Representative everywhere he goes. They bid him "good morning" when he awakes and "good night" when he retires, and finally in sheer desperation they get him in the mood of the young lady who married her unwelcome suitor in order to get rid of him. He indorses their applications and they transfer their importunities at once to the executive department. The consulship is filled, and the happy man, armed with his credentials, starts for the point where he is to shed luster and renown on our Government and forward its interests for a salary munificent and tempting.

We recognize that every wideawake official appreciates the necessity for prompt action looking in the direction of elevating the service, and we recognize also the difficulty of those who seek practical means to bring about a wholesome change. Those who suggest the establishment of diplomatic schools to fit men for the consular service meet the objection of those that the applicants shall have practical experience before they shall be trusted with such responsibilities.

Those who suggest civil-service examination meet the objection of the chronic, who is opposed to anything connected with the despised words "civil service;" but nevertheless the merit system gains friends and supporters of the cause every day and keeps on demonstrating that ability and education should be recognized and that the examination should be broad enough to cover all characteristics of particular merit for the service. Acquaintance with the language of the post to which the official is assigned ought to be a prerequisite. Definite tenure of office gains friends, and there are few who believe that consuls should be retired every four years. A reorganization looking toward rearrangement and general increase of the salary paid is one part of the plan which everyone must favor, which seems quite practicable, and which few will deny. The fee system is no more suitable here than it is in offices of a similar character in our large cities. Make a man depend on the amount which he receives for transacting the public business, and you make him a servant of himself and not of the people. Public fees should be turned into the public Treasury, and the officer should depend on a prescribed compensation, definite and certain.

Some say that they do not desire that our consul should be made a drummer for the business interests. One of the very complaints made now is that many of our consuls are drummers, not for the business of the United States, but for certain concerns in the United States and foreign countries, and are made so by certain temptations held out to them, caused by the inadequacy of the compensation and the improper appreciation of the ethical duty toward our Government which employs them.

The problem, of course, requires study, and its solution rests in a general compromise, after a careful and rigid investigation of all

the defects in the service, between the radical who sees little good in the service at present and the conservatives who are perfectly satisfied with the present status.

The searchlight of publicity should be turned on the service, its personnel improved, its character made more honorable, and its compensation greater.

The great value which an efficient consular service will be to our country in the advancement of trade, in the dissemination of knowledge of this country, its aims, its objects, its possibilities, its products, and its desires, must be admitted by all. Let us give less time to the consideration of abstract theories in our foreign relations, and let us expend more energy in seeking to advance our interests and utilize trade as a civilizing influence in working out our share of the world's destiny.

This is a subject which Congress should be eager to take up and which should receive its best thought and judgment on the question of the improvement of the service. And it should keep religiously at it until the time shall come when the world can appreciate our seriousness when we stand here and declare that our consular service is the best in the world, and it shall show the wisdom and economy in the vast annual expenditure of the people's money for the maintenance of this system, which ought to be useful as well as ornamental. [Applause.]

Mr. HITT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS] twenty-five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. There are only eighteen minutes remaining.

Mr. DINSMORE. I ask unanimous consent that the time be extended so that the gentleman from Nevada may have twenty-five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Unanimous consent is asked that the time for general debate be extended so that the gentleman from Nevada may have twenty-five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. NEWLANDS addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. HITT. The time for general debate is now exhausted; but the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. DINSMORE], I think, wished to ask unanimous consent for a member to whom time had been promised.

Mr. CLARK. The gentleman from Montana [Mr. EDWARDS].

Mr. HITT. As I desire that faith shall be kept with everyone, I ask unanimous consent that the time for general debate be extended for five minutes. As I understand, after we enter upon the consideration of the bill under the five-minute rule a point of order will lie upon the ground of irrelevancy to any remarks not germane to the bill, but it does not lie now.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Montana [Mr. EDWARDS] will be recognized for five minutes, if there be no objection.

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I read from page 1934 of the RECORD:

Mr. TAWNEY. What did the Democratic governor of Montana do with respect to the railroad merger that the gentleman alludes to?

Mr. BURLESON. If he is not in line with the governor of Minnesota in his protest against the railroad merger, then I, as a Democrat, repudiate him.

Mr. TAWNEY. He is not, and he repudiates you. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Now, I want to read to the gentlemen and the House some of the utterances of Governor Toole on that question. In a letter to Governor Van Sant, written November 26, 1901, Governor Toole said:

If you have rightly interpreted the purpose of this organization, as it relates to the State of Minnesota, there would seem to be no doubt but that such a consolidation is a violation of the spirit if not the letter of our constitution.

I am not sufficiently advised at this time to indicate what remedies are available to defeat this consolidation and its purpose to control the rates of transportation in this State, but whatever lawful methods are available will be employed, and to this extent our cooperation may be relied upon.

I have not devoted any time to the consideration of the discussion going on in the press, as to whether the unobstructed and successful launching of this gigantic combination would prove dangerous and detrimental to the commercial welfare of the Northwest, or whether it would eventuate, as claimed by some, in giving stability and steadiness to transportation charges, and hence redound to the public good, but have considered that question settled by what seems to me to be the plain plenary and positive provisions of the constitution and laws of Montana, designed to prohibit the very things which confessedly the Northern Securities could not do directly, but which it is avowedly attempting to do indirectly.

It may be, as claimed by counsel representing the Northern Securities Company, that the scheme embodied in this organization is a successful evasion of our constitution and laws, but until the court of last resort has sanctioned such combination and its purpose no such contingency ought to be accepted for a moment.

And assuring Governor Van Sant that Attorney-General Donovan is opposed to this invasion of the constitution and statutes of Montana, and will give such assistance as he can in any procedure finally determined upon.

An interview given out on December 26, in regard to the rumor that the merger roads were going to reduce freight rates so as to show that the merger means lower instead of higher rates, Governor Toole said of the promise of lower rates:

"This would be a good thing—certainly as long as it lasted. The great



trouble found in reconciling one's self to such seductive overtures lies in the constitution and laws prohibiting the consolidation of parallel or competing lines, and the formation of what is known as a trust, more than in any incredulity which such an offer at such a time might create.

"The power to reduce rates carries with it the power to increase rates, and the exercise of this power by a combination of individuals or corporations, whether for good or bad, appears to be the thing prohibited. Right or wrong, wise or foolish, this prohibition is firmly ingrafted into the public policy of this State. The generally accepted reasons for this, if such are required, may be found in a decision of the supreme court of Texas, where the following language is used:

"To fix by combination a rate lower than the one that has prevailed carries with it the power and ability to establish higher ones, and the object of the statute is to free business and commerce from being controlled by combinations, whether of persons or corporations. It does not matter that the immediate result of combination may be a reduction in the price of commodities. A dangerous arbitrary power has been lodged in its hands, by which the business of the country may be absolutely dominated and prices arbitrarily controlled, regardless of the laws of trade or the rules of supply and demand. If the combination be one 'to create or carry out restrictions in trade or commerce or aids to commerce,' no matter what may be the result of the combination, the law has been violated.

"The law does not look to the results. The object of the statute is to guard the commerce and trade of the State, so that it may flow in its regular channels, subject to the law of supply and demand, and untrammelled by combination of man or corporation which can at will control their course. The State is unwilling to trust to any combination, even though of her creatures, the tyrannical and oppressive power that is inseparably connected with the power to raise and lower prices of commodities and control the trade of the country.

"It does not matter that the parties to the unlawful combination may not have been actuated by any bad motive, or that the public may have been temporarily benefited by it, such combination was incompatible with public policy and is condemned by law.

"The inquiry is not as to the degree of injury inflicted upon the public. It is sufficient to know that the inevitable tendency of the act is injurious to the public."

Resolutions adopted by the antimerger conference in Helena on December 31:

"In our opinion, the consolidation or threatened consolidation of the Great Northern, Northern Pacific, and Burlington railway systems, in the several States through which they run, as parallel and competing lines, is contrary to sound public policy and also, with the exception of Idaho, is in violation of the constitution or laws of said States. And mindful of the obligation which the law imposes in such cases upon the officials of the several States here represented, we hereby give our unqualified approval and indorsement to any proper and suitable proceedings which may be instituted in any court having jurisdiction by the sovereign State of Minnesota, or any other State affected thereby, designed or intended to speedily and finally test and determine the validity of such consolidation or threatened consolidation; and to that end we hereby pledge our earnest cooperation, and, further, we unanimously protest against any combination or consolidation which restricts or stifles free competition in the trade or commerce of the country."

Governor Toole was chairman of the committee that drafted that resolution. After its adoption by the conference Governor Toole signed it, as did the other conferees present. And here is another resolution passed by the conference:

"Whereas a consolidation of the great transcontinental railway lines has been accomplished or threatened, which in the opinion of the members of this conference is inimical to the public welfare: Therefore, be it

*Resolved*, First. That the Congress of the United States be, and is hereby, requested to investigate the general subject and take suitable action thereon.

Second. That power should be granted to the Interstate Commerce Commission to fix maximum rates upon interstate traffic and to regulate the same.

Third. That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded to the Senators and Representatives in Congress of the States here represented."

The Indiana courts seem to entertain the same view. "The authorities affirm," says the court, "as a general rule, that if the act complained of by its results will restrict or stifle competition the law will regard such act as incompatible with public policy, without proof of evil intent on the part of the actor or actual injury to the public. The inquiry is not as to the degree of injury inflicted upon the public. It is sufficient to know that the inevitable tendency of the act is injurious to the public."

And so I may add that the promise to reduce rates may be made in the utmost good faith, with every intention of fulfillment, upon the part of the president of the Northern Securities Company, but such a promise, however tempting, can not overcome or neutralize the effect of the constitution and laws which the executive is called upon to enforce."

The anti-merger conference was held in Governor Toole's office; he was chairman of the committee on resolutions, and since the conferences on public occasions he has said:

The results of the conference were eminently satisfactory to me. The resolutions adopted express my views.

And I want to say to you that when we adopted those resolutions we meant what we said. There is no string tied to them.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. CLARK. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana have leave to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

There was no objection.

The Committee of the Whole then proceeded to consider the bill by paragraphs under the five-minute rule.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### SALARIES OF AMBASSADORS AND MINISTERS.

Ambassadors extraordinary and plenipotentiary to France, Germany, Great Britain, Mexico, and Russia, at \$17,500 each, \$87,500.

Mr. OLMSTED. I wish to ask the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs why the ambassador to Mexico is allowed a salary of \$17,500 and three secretaries, while the ambassador to Italy is allowed only \$12,000 and two secretaries?

Mr. HITT. In order to conform to the rule, I will move to amend by striking out the last word, and will answer the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The mission to Mexico was formerly at a lower rate of salary, and, of course, a lower grade. It is a far more important mission

than the one to Italy. It has many times the amount of business. And it was, therefore, raised in pay and in grade until it was finally made an embassy. The relations between this country and Mexico are now so extensive that it was long ago deemed necessary, for reasons which were duly considered by the House and Senate, that the increasing dignity and importance of this mission should be recognized. We have \$250,000,000 of American money there in railroads and other investments, and thousands of our citizens are deeply interested there.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREEN] raised a very grave question, one that is worthy of exhaustive debate, one which challenges the sum total of the wisdom of this House. It is the improvement of the consular service of the United States. It is extremely easy to inveigh against any system. It is a great deal more difficult to suggest an improvement. It is easy to make a diagnosis of the disease, but it seems almost impossible to prescribe an adequate remedy. I wish to say, in the first place, that the Committee on Foreign Affairs has spent a great deal of time studying this question, talking about it, and hearing delegations from boards of trade all over this country, that have come into our room for the purpose of enlightening us. We have done our best to devise a better plan. I repeat what I said in an interlocutory way a little while ago, that, leaving myself out of consideration, I believe the Foreign Affairs Committee shows as high an average of intelligence as the House itself contains, and to prove that that is true there is nothing else necessary to be done than to read the list of the members of that committee.

It is composed of the following Representatives: ROBERT R. HITT, of Illinois; ROBERT ADAMS, jr., of Pennsylvania, both of whom have had large diplomatic experience; ROBERT G. COUSINS, of Iowa; WILLIAM ALDEN SMITH, of Michigan; JOEL P. HEATWOLE, of Minnesota; FREDERICK H. GILLET, of Massachusetts; CHARLES B. LANDIS, of Indiana; JAMES B. PERKINS, of New York; JACOB A. BEIDLER, of Ohio; DAVID J. FOSTER, of Vermont; THEOBOLD OTJEN, of Wisconsin; HUGH A. DINSMORE, of Arkansas, who has had a good deal of diplomatic experience himself; WILLIAM M. HOWARD, of Georgia; ALBERT S. BURLINSON, of Texas; CHARLES E. HOOKER, of Mississippi; HENRY F. NAPHEN, of Massachusetts, and myself. The members of that committee are just as anxious to improve the consular service of the United States as any other member of this House can possibly be. The evidence in the case shows, when these visiting gentlemen come before the Foreign Affairs Committee and are cross-examined, which is the surest way of eliciting the truth, that our consular service ranks among the very best consular systems in the world.

Another fact is demonstrated on cross-examination, and that is that the consular service of the United States is constantly improving. The trouble about it is that there are certain doctrinaires in this country who are determined that the consular service of the United States shall be put under a hard-and-fast civil-service system of examination, and who denounce as "spoilsmen" all who do not accept their ideas and plans without question and without amendment. I want to say, speaking for myself and the entire Democratic party, that we are not opposed to a merit system. I repeat that with emphasis, so that no idiot can go away from here and misconstrue it [laughter], that the Democratic party is not opposed to a merit system based on common sense. We are not opposed to a merit system, but we are opposed to life tenure in office. It is both undemocratic and un-American. I have an old-fashioned idea that when the Republicans carry the election in this country they have a right to the offices and when the Democrats carry it they have a right to them; and certainly Democrats do not carry it often enough to form the chronic habit of office holding. [Laughter.]

I undertake to say, without the fear of successful contradiction, that it is a libel on American intelligence and on the public-school system of this country, which we so proudly vaunt and which costs so much, to say that out of the 6,000,000 men who voted for William J. Bryan in 1900 you can not find 200,000 fit to hold these appointive offices under the President of the United States; and it is a greater libel, simply because there were more of them and not because they were more intelligent, to say that out of the 7,000,000 Republicans who voted for William McKinley you can not find 200,000 fit to hold these offices. If a system could be devised of this sort there would be some sense in it; that is, when the Democrats are in power, have it understood that they are to appoint Democrats.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CLARK. I would like to have ten minutes more.

Mr. HITT. I move to strike out the last two words. With that I will consent that the gentleman may proceed for five minutes more.

Mr. CLARK. That gives me ten minutes—five minutes for each word. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.



Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that his time be extended ten minutes further.

Mr. HITT. If we get to unanimous consent, we will never get through. I will try and arrange it to give the gentleman his time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman be extended. Is there objection?

Mr. HITT. I object. I object to unanimous consent for ten minutes, but the gentleman has the floor to speak on the amendment for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. CLARK. I say this, that when the Democrats are in power, if you would have a rule that the appointees should be Democrats, and then that they should be thoroughly examined, that would be all right, and the same way when the Republicans are in power; but here is the objection in this consular business to the civil-service-reform examination as now conducted.

They do not ascertain a man's fitness to be a consul, because the examinations are not about things which a consul ought to know in order to render the best service.

I stated on the floor of this House once, and I repeat it now, that in my judgment, notwithstanding there are over two hundred college graduates in this House and a proportional number in the Senate, there are not 30 men in both Houses who could stand an examination for a \$900 clerkship over here in one of the departments. [Laughter.] Why is that true? I will tell you. It is true because the men who are fit to sit in the Congress of the United States have forgotten the things that they are examined on in these examinations over there. That is the truth about it.

Men are fit to serve in House and Senate, not because they have forgotten certain things but because they have learned more important things. The latter things crowd the former out of their minds. To undertake to examine men for consular positions in one of the civil-service examinations, as now conducted, will end in this, that you will get a lot of men just out of school who know nothing about business, while business knowledge is the most necessary qualification for consul, as it is a purely business office. Napoleon picked his marshals by the shape of their noses. [Laughter.] I undertake to say that there is not a man on this floor who can not go into his own district and pick the men who are fit to be consuls anywhere by their business capacity, because he knows them and understands what they are good for. Natural pride would compel him to select the most competent.

Now, somebody says that you get a lot of backwoods politicians who have delivered delegates to somebody. We never have any delegates in the district which I have the honor to represent, for we have primaries. "Backwoods" districts are not the only places where there are a job lot of politicians hanging around. [Laughter.] I have heard that politicians abound in great cities and deliver delegates sometimes. Another thing, the men who run this House, as a rule, are backwoods men. They come from the country or from little towns. There never has been but one man nominated for President of the United States from a great city. That was Grover Cleveland in his second term, the greatest calamity that has happened to the human race since the fall of Adam. [Laughter.]

Mr. FEELY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit a short question?

Mr. CLARK. Yes, with pleasure.

Mr. FEELY. Does the gentleman believe the members of this House can go into their districts and find men fit to hold these positions who will accept them for the salary now paid?

Mr. CLARK. The question of salaries is a different question. I will come to that after a while. I say that I can find men in my Congressional district, and every man on this floor can find men who are fit to fill these consular places anywhere. This talk about backwoods statesmen and backwoods districts makes me very weary. [Laughter.]

We have fallen of late years into the habit of selecting West Point candidates by competitive examinations. That gives all the boys a fair chance; but if that rule had been in force years ago neither Stonewall Jackson nor Ulysses S. Grant would ever have seen the inside of the West Point Academy.

I wish to say to my friends from Pennsylvania and Tennessee and Chicago that we are not combating their proposition that this service ought to be improved, but what we do combat is the performance of these gentlemen coming in here and making a broadside criticism of the Committee on Foreign Affairs when the Committee on Foreign Affairs is doing the very best it can. Time and time again in that committee, when these self-appointed delegations have appeared from these boards of trade, we have tried to get them to suggest something that is feasible, and you never get a single practical suggestion out of the whole gang; never.

Now as to the question of salary. There is a great deal of rot got off around this Capitol, first and last, to the effect that men are not getting big enough salaries. I undertake to say this, Mr. Chairman, that if every Federal officeholder from Theodore Roosevelt down to the cuspidor cleaners in this House, including every member of the House and the Senate, were to die to-night, their places could be filled within a month by men just as capable as the men who hold the offices now, and they will take them at the same salaries, too. [Laughter.] The ins and not the outs clamor for higher salaries. I want to reiterate on this floor a statement that Senator BAILEY made the other day in the Senate. I take a great deal of pride in the fact that a prophecy which I have made about him time and time again was partially verified yesterday—that in less than two years from the time he set foot in the Senate he would demonstrate that he was the strongest debater in that body. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The Clerk will read.

Mr. HITT. If the Chair will have the Clerk read the next few lines, I will make the formal motion and yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to Italy, \$12,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair suggests to the gentleman from Missouri that it is not in order to refer in debate to the remarks of a member of the other body.

Mr. HITT. I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. CLARK. If the gentleman will yield to me, I will take the time.

I want to repeat what Senator BAILEY said about salaries in discussing the question of the salaries of judges. He said he hoped the time would never come in this country when the salaries of the officers would be made so large that the salary itself would be the main temptation or inducement to a man to hold an office. [Applause.] That is right, too. There is not one of us that does not feel that the honor attaching to our position is of greater value than the salary. I will say now that we do not get as much as the judges of the United States, and yet there are plenty of men in this House who are thoroughly fit to be judges of the Supreme Court of the United States who are just as good lawyers as any of the men on that bench.

Nobody ever heard of any office, great or small, going begging. There are always many more applicants than positions. Lincoln's story of the excess of pigs and the paucity of teats is as applicable to-day as when he told it first. No office is ever vacant for an hour because the pay is too small; but as soon as the average citizen is safely installed in office—especially if he holds by life tenure—he begins yelling and lobbying to have his wages increased. If he does not like his pay, he has his remedy. He can resign. There are others who stand ready to take his place. We all know that people want to get the Federal appointive offices, even at the present salaries; otherwise they would not apply for them.

Now, let us see what is the duty of a consul. My friend from Chicago and my friend from Pennsylvania—I did not happen to hear what the gentleman from Tennessee said, as I was out—seem to think that the sole duty of a consul is to act as a drummer for somebody in Europe, Asia, Africa, or wherever he happens to be. I deny that it is the function of the consul. If the American Tobacco Company (of which the gentleman spoke) wants to sell its tobacco in Europe, Asia, or Africa, let the American Tobacco Company do exactly in those countries what it does in the United States—send its drummers out and solicit trade at its own expense.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Our consuls get a commission to do that.

Mr. CLARK. That is aside from their business.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. They are drummers.

Mr. CLARK. I will tell you what a respectable consul ought to be. Above all he should be a man of incorruptible integrity, an American to his heart's core, proud of his country. In addition thereto he ought to be a man of good common sense, of fair intelligence in business matters generally, and of indefatigable industry. His duty is to take care of American interests in general, and to inform our Government as to trade conditions in the country where he is domiciled. He should not be the agent for any particular sort of our products or for any particular house. To be a drummer is as honorable as to be a consul; but the two functions should not be combined in one person because they are incompatible. A man can not serve two masters.

It will be a sad day for the American Republic when our consular service is converted into a service of drummers pure and simple; because, when that is done, you will witness the sordid spectacle in this capital of great commercial, manufacturing, and exporting houses scrambling and fighting among themselves, each struggling to have its own man appointed consul, to act as a drummer for its special interest at the public expense. It



surely can not be that any sane man desires such a state of affairs as that.

Instead of making jimcrack speeches in criticism of the consular service of this country, let every man in this House put on his thinking cap and make to the Committee on Foreign Affairs a practical suggestion—and without being authorized to do it, I assume the responsibility of speaking for the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HITT], the chairman, and the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. DINSMORE], the ranking Democrat on that committee, and for all the members of the committee and saying that every such suggestion will receive all the courtesy, consideration, and wisdom that we can command. [Loud applause.]

Mr. HITT. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Envoys extraordinary and ministers plenipotentiary to Austria, Brazil, China, Japan, and Spain, at \$12,000 each, \$60,000.

Mr. DINSMORE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in view of what has been said upon this side of the House by gentlemen upon this subject, and to supplement what has been said so very forcibly by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], I want to submit two or three observations. The Committee on Foreign Affairs has not been indifferent to the importance of this question. They have given it thought and sober consideration, and the suggestions made by these gentlemen are quite welcome to us. They are only in keeping with many suggestions that have been made in advice given by gentlemen who have come before the committee and insisted upon a reform in the consular service.

It is the desire of the Committee on Foreign Affairs to get the very best consular service possible; but when we are enjoined to make a reform, the committee would be glad to be advised as to how the reform shall be made. When gentlemen say the consular service should be better, and we ask them to designate in what respect and how it may be made so, we are told to increase the salaries. I want for one to interpose a respectful protest to that.

I do not believe that an increase in salaries will bring a greater efficiency in the service. At the same time I must admit I believe it is possible and even probable that the consuls in some particulars are not sufficiently paid. I do not wish the House to believe that I would have them underpaid. As a Representative interested in the public service of the country, in behalf of my own constituents, I say that they ought to be sufficiently paid.

But, Mr. Chairman, I have not much patience with this constant insistence that we hear from all quarters about increasing salaries. I believe that the officials of the Federal Government are, as a rule, sufficiently paid, and that when we increase salaries or compensation we do not, as a rule, increase the efficiency of the service. Increase of compensation often adds to the splendor and style of living, and I fear detracts from efficiency of service.

How shall we proceed to improve the service? I agree with my colleague, I agree with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] who addressed the House this afternoon, that the United States has to-day a consular service equal, if not superior, to any other country in the world. [Applause.]

It is true that we do not put men into the consular service in their young days and keep them there continually, elevating them from one position to another, secure against removal; but I beg to suggest to this House that that system would not improve the efficiency of the men. I know that in many instances our consuls are not fair representatives and do not come up to the standard of requirement; but I am disposed to believe that these are the exceptions.

Having been a little more than three years in the foreign service myself, I have had an opportunity to observe something of the relative merits and standing of American consuls abroad with those of other countries, and I take a great deal of pride in saying, before the House and the country, that, with rare exceptions, I have never known anything to make me feel that the Government had cause to feel ashamed of its consular reputation. [Applause.]

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Will the gentleman from Arkansas allow me a question?

Mr. DINSMORE. With pleasure.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I would like to ask the gentleman, from his experience and knowledge of consular matters, whether the placing of the consular agents and consuls under the civil service by President Cleveland improved the service; what does the gentleman think upon that subject?

Mr. DINSMORE. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe it did improve the service. I know that it was the desire of the Department of State to do so, and I attribute to this House and to these gentlemen who have made suggestions an interest in public affairs which prompted them, and a desire to bring about an im-

provement. But we have so often had occasion to observe the effect of these things when they come to practical application, and have so often found that they failed to bring about that which was desired, that I am not convinced that the application of the civil-service rules to the consular service will give us a more efficient system.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. HITT. I move to strike out the last two words, and I will yield the time to the gentleman from Arkansas.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks that under the rules the gentleman had no right to yield time.

Mr. HITT. I made the motion and the gentleman was speaking in opposition to my motion.

The CHAIRMAN. Let the Clerk report the next paragraph. The Clerk read as follows:

Envoys extraordinary and ministers plenipotentiary to the Argentine Republic, Belgium, Chile, Colombia, Netherlands, Peru, Turkey, and Venezuela, at \$10,000 each, \$80,000.

Mr. DINSMORE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I know that the proposition would commend itself to the ordinary mind and intelligence to have consuls, or men to represent the Government, or in any other branch of the service selected under a system of examination with a view to ascertaining their fitness for the duties which they are to perform, and that it would bring about more efficiency. But, unfortunately, it has been our experience that these examinations are not conducted upon lines which are calculated to disclose whether they are qualified for the performance of the duties which they are to perform.

Let me give an instance. It is not entirely in line, but it is upon the subject of civil service. I have a friend in my district who, under Mr. Cleveland's first administration, filed an application with the Government to be appointed a postal inspector. He had been engaged in the postal service of the United States about eight years. His father was postmaster of the town in which I live. He was a young gentleman of intelligence, education, and fine business capacity. He had been in that office, and I have reason to know myself was thoroughly familiar with all the postal regulations of the Government. He had informed himself about everything appertaining to the duties of the service. He thought he was qualified to make a good postal inspector, and he came on to Washington and stood an examination.

In that examination he was asked questions, scientific questions, on subjects that no postal examiner would ever be called upon to know in the performance of his duties. He was asked catch questions in geography, mathematics, and physical science that only a boy fresh from school would be expected to be informed upon, and he failed.

Another young man was appointed postal inspector who knew absolutely nothing about the postal service, but because he knew more about the matters that he was examined upon and with which he was familiar from his recent school experience.

Now, let me give another experience that came to me from my own observation in the consular service. Gentlemen go abroad to represent us, and may come from what my friend from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] calls the backwoods district and, perhaps, have not the manners which commend themselves to the dilettante gentry who travel over the country globe trotting to see the world. Their manners may not be good, but nevertheless they may have something back of these manners which may make them eminently fit to perform the duties of their position.

Mr. FEELY. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. DINSMORE. Certainly.

Mr. FEELY. I want to ask the gentleman if a large per cent of the men now holding consular positions are not of the same dilettante globe-trotting class of which the gentleman speaks.

Mr. DINSMORE. It may be so since the civil-service rules were applied and adopted by a former Administration.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. And continued by the present Administration.

Mr. DINSMORE. And, as my friend from Tennessee says, continued by the present Administration.

But I want to get at the manner in which men are selected for these positions under the system which at present obtains, and which was referred to by my friend from Missouri who has just taken his seat. A Congressman who recommends a citizen of his district for appointment as consul is not fit to represent his people in Congress if the man whom he selects is not chosen with reference to his fitness for the position. A Congressman having a proper regard for his duty and his responsibilities to his Government and his own people will not recommend a man for a position in the foreign service unless he believes he can perform the duties of the office respectably and acceptably.

I say, further, when you talk about politicians from the cross-roads who can furnish delegates for a convention, that when a



man has manifested his ability to control men even in a convention he has manifested an ability which will serve him well in any other position which he may be called upon to fill.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Do you think a man ought to be made a consul for such a reason?

Mr. DINSMORE. Perhaps not. I merely make that remark in answer to an argument that has been made here. But I shall come to the point to which the gentleman from Tennessee now directs my attention.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. FEELY. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arkansas be allowed to proceed.

Mr. HITT. I object. Let the reading of the bill be resumed, and then the gentleman from Arkansas can offer an amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to Nicaragua, Costa Rica, and Salvador, \$10,000.

Mr. DINSMORE. I move to amend by striking out the last word.

When interrupted I was directing my remarks to the objections raised to the consular representatives of the United States abroad. Some years ago a gentleman of West Virginia was selected to be consul at Nagasaki, Japan. He was a parvenu, so to speak, in consular matters. He had never been abroad—perhaps he had never been out of the confines of the State of West Virginia, unless it may have been to come to this capital or to go to New York. On arriving at Nagasaki he found it inconvenient to secure proper quarters for his consulate.

He could not get a house in which to establish his office. But he found an American merchant doing business in Nagasaki, who said to him: "You can have these rooms above my store." So Mr. Birch, the gentleman of whom I am speaking, took the rooms above that store and hoisted his flag. He was immediately tabooed by the whole consular fraternity there and by the community. Why? Because the English idea of affairs obtained out there, and shopkeepers were not considered entirely respectable people. Mr. Birch had set up his consulate in a shopkeeper's establishment.

On making application at that time to become a member of the Nagasaki Club, Mr. Birch was blackballed; he was not admitted to the club. But I take pleasure in saying that before John M. Birch had been in that port two years he was recognized as the best consul there, and was president of the same club which had before blackballed him for putting his flag over a shop.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. As a matter of fact, the consul at Nagasaki now has handsome headquarters up on the side of the hill.

Mr. DINSMORE. I am very glad to hear it, though I do not know that it is very material to the present question.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. The consulate has been moved away from the store.

Mr. DINSMORE. Yes, it was moved away from the store very soon. But that same American spirit in the heart and mind of John M. Birch which prompted him to put up his flag wherever he might find a place for it to wave is the same spirit that makes the flexible American character, which makes Americans better fitted to be consuls or anything else than any other men occupying such positions abroad.

And so it is in other ports. At Shanghai, Mr. Kennedy, now dead; at Kobe, Mr. Thomas R. Jernigan; at Yokohama, Mr. Greathouse; at Hongkong, Mr. Withers, of Virginia. Notwithstanding they had had no previous training and were selected without competitive examination, all stood at the very top of the consular representation in the countries where they were respectively stationed; and when at the end of the Administration these gentlemen, as it was thought, would be recalled, petitions were sent up to our Government, signed by all nationalities in those ports, asking for their retention in the service.

Our consuls abroad are usually officers of efficiency and ability. They have not been selected under civil-service regulations; they have not been selected under the ideas which gentlemen here think ought to obtain; but they were selected by Congressmen and Senators, because it was thought they would be capable and reputable representatives of the United States in consular positions.

A MEMBER. And because they were men.

Mr. DINSMORE. And because they were men, capable men.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to state further in my observance of these things, I have been led to believe that there is something in the genius of American institutions that better fits a man for responsibility than the ordinary groove into which men fall under civil-service rules and regulations. You take the British service. They have some very estimable men, some very able men, but they start in for a career in the consular service. They begin as student interpreters in the Orient, and they are promoted from time to time and they spend their lives there. All they have to

do is to render acceptable service and they know they will be retained.

They fall into a groove; they do not aspire to get outside; they are slow to take responsibilities; they shirk them; they submit questions to their superiors for settlement, but I was always proud to observe that the American, taught from his youth to fit himself for any occupation into which he might be thrown, for any duties which might devolve upon him, in his consular responsibilities was always prepared to act, and usually he acted so well that he received the approval of his Government at home. I believe they are more capable. I believe the very fact that they were not there holding a secure position in which they might decay had a tendency to make them more efficient in their service and that they brought about better results for our country. Occasionally they fail; occasionally we get a man who is incompetent to perform the duties of his office; occasionally there comes a man of whom we are ashamed, a recent illustration of which we had before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, when a gentleman testified as to certain things that the consul had written; but taking them by and large as a whole, I believe that in the consular service and in every other service America has had as good representation as any other nation. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to Guatemala and Honduras, \$10,000.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last words. I regret that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] is about to leave the Hall, because the gentleman in his speech, that we all enjoyed as usual, alluded to what he supposed I said, as he was not present when I addressed the committee a few moments ago.

In making his splendid speech he said exactly what I had said—that is, that some of our consuls—and I met some on this trip—are drummers for American firms; and why? Because they can not maintain themselves with the salary that we pay, so they said. We went to the headquarters of one I have in mind, in a dark, deserted, cold—no, it was not cold, it was hot—hot place, that not a member of this House would live in, and there we found articles of cotton goods from Atlanta, and goods from St. Louis, and goods from Chicago, and goods from New York, all in a sample case, and his little cups and various little boxes and various drumming paraphernalia that he put under his arm and peddled around throughout the town.

And why? To make a living—not that he cared so much for the American commerce, I dare say, but to make a living. Now, I am glad that my distinguished friend from Missouri condemns that practice. I say that the consul to whom I refer showed that he was industrious, that he wanted to make an honest living, and was doubtless doing so.

Now, is that the proper way to have a consular service? If it is, gentlemen, you are having it that way in some places. I agree with my friend, the great champion of American rights and American manhood, the gentleman from Missouri, that it is the men who come from the backwoods that have always ruled and always will rule and always should rule this country; but not all of them, Mr. Chairman, are men who should and can fill any position, because they are not all competent.

Now, my friend from Arkansas [Mr. DINSMORE] admits something I believe that my friend from Missouri did not admit, to wit, that there are defects in our service and in the personnel of our consular service. I do not speak of the law, because I know nothing of the law, but I know something of the personnel of this service, and I say, Mr. Chairman, that the personnel of our consular service can be improved upon and should be improved upon by Congress or by the appointing power in a number of places between New York and the Philippine Islands.

I do not know who appointed them. Many of them have been in position for years. Some of them are quite young men, and certainly they could not have been there very long; but the fact remains, as I have stated, that their headquarters were not as they should be, as shown by the example mentioned by my friend from Arkansas [Mr. DINSMORE], who alluded to our consul at Nagasaki, a beautiful city clustered all around a magnificent bay, an ancient city, by the consul going there and hanging out the American flag over some man's third-class business store.

Did he stay there? No. He now has splendid headquarters upon the side of the hill, with the American flag floating over it, and a good officer he must be. I did not see him; he had his clerk there to represent him. He was absent. I believe he was in the United States.

Now, I say, gentlemen, that I am as good an American, I believe, as any man in this House, and love my country as much and will do as much, and if I do not do it I will try to do as much as any other man in this House for its promotion, regardless of politics, and I shall continue to do it, and I dislike to criticize; but I do say, as a duty, here and now, that there are places where



the personnel of the consular service could be and should be improved.

Mr. DINSMORE. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. DINSMORE. I merely want to ask my friend if he will suggest to us some means by which we may improve the consular service.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I wish to say that I do not believe there is a member of that committee who would be derelict in his duty if he knew where the fault was, but I say, Mr. Chairman, that certainly one fault is in the appointing power appointing inferior men. I do not care whether the appointee comes from the city or from a village or a town or from the country. In every instance where a man is efficient I hope he comes from the country, for my part.

Mr. Chairman, I am for the country man as against the city man every time. [Applause.] As a rule, that is equitable; it is just. It often in the start evens up the city and country boy in the race of life. I know what the trials of a country boy are, and as long as I can, here or elsewhere, give him a helping hand I will. I have and I shall continue to do so. Regardless of the city or country man, we, I say, have inferior consular service in some places.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR], in his usual adroit manner of defense, said that our service was all right in Paris. I do not doubt that in the least. I did not go to Paris. He says it is all right in Europe. I have not been to Europe.

I have not the least doubt in the world but what in London, in Frankfurt, in Berlin, in Italy, in Greece, and in various other places I might mention, there is a magnificent ambassador, as we know there is, and a splendid consul, as I presume there is; and these must be so, because the gentleman from Ohio says it is so. But I say, Mr. Chairman, and I say it to the delectable chairman of this committee [Mr. HITT], whose friendship I enjoy and whose confidence I hope I have, that there are men in the consular service who should not be in it at any salary.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask to extend my remarks in the RECORD. I think I can add to them some suggestions.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Now, Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

As I understand the question, it is not as my friend from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] suggests, that we are here to improve the consular service by making a Democratic consular service or a Republican consular service, according to whether the President is a Democrat or a Republican. I thought we were here to improve and rehabilitate the United States consular service. I think this consular service should be for the benefit of the American people and not for the benefit of the Democratic party or the Republican party, and to the extent that you bring politics into this service you injure it.

You will find that to be true. The most favorable statement made to-day about this consular service is that where we have had first-class consuls the people in those places have made their wishes known and asked that they be retained in spite of a change in Administration. Now, I say we can go a step further. We can have a system of inspection of this consular service. Certainly under a system of inspection the inferior men who are acting as consuls must, some of them at least, be found out, and I hope they will be removed.

And where we have a good man who is fitted to occupy a better place that man should be promoted. Then, I believe, we will reach the merit system. So, I say, promote efficient men who are capable of filling more responsible positions, and remove those men who are unfit to occupy any position. We can accomplish this by an honest and efficient system of inspection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Minister resident and consul-general to Korea, \$7,500."

Mr. HITT. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 3, in line 6, strike out the words "minister resident and consul-general" and insert "envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary."

The amendment was agreed to.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, a message from the Senate, by Mr. PARKINSON, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with

amendments bill of the following title; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

H. R. 5833. An act temporarily to provide revenue for the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

Senate concurrent resolution 26:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed the number of copies hereafter stated of Tables of an Annotated Index to the Congressional Series of the United States Public Documents, prepared under the supervision of the Superintendent of Documents, 5,000 copies; 1,000 copies for the use of the Senate, 3,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives, and 1,000 for the Superintendent of Documents.*

#### CONSULAR AND DIPLOMATIC APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

Consul-general at Constantinople and agent at Sofia, \$5,000;

Mr. HITT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out lines 14 and 15. The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out lines 14 and 15 on page 3.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Total, \$300,000.

Mr. HITT. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend line 19 by striking out "ninety" and inserting "eighty-five;" so that it will read "\$385,000."

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend line 19, page 3, by striking out "ninety" and inserting "eighty-five;" so that it will read "three hundred and eighty-five."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Secretaries of legations to Argentine Republic, Venezuela, and Peru, at \$1,800 each, Liberia and Korea, at \$1,500 each, \$3,400.

Mr. HITT. I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 5, line 6, amend by inserting, after the word "Korea," the words "(who shall be consul-general to Seoul)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### CONTINGENT EXPENSES, FOREIGN MISSIONS.

To enable the President to provide, at the public expense, all such stationery, blanks, records, and other books, seals, presses, flags, and signs as he shall think necessary for the several embassies and legations in the transaction of their business, and also for rent, postage, telegrams, furniture, messenger service, clerk hire, compensation of kavasses, guards, dragomen, and porters, including compensation of interpreter, guards, and Arabic clerk at the consulate at Tangiers, and the compensation of dispatch agents at London, New York, and San Francisco, and for traveling and miscellaneous expenses of embassies and legations, and for printing in the Department of State, and for loss on bills of exchange to and from embassies and legations, \$175,000.

Mr. HITT. I move to strike out the last word. I stated in explaining the bill that I would call attention to any item in which there was a considerable change. This is the largest item in this part of the bill, and it contains an increase of \$25,000. This branch of the appropriation last year was \$150,000 for contingent expenses, foreign missions. That is now increased by \$25,000, making it \$175,000. It is caused by the general enlargement of business, corresponding to the enlargement and growth of our country. By reading the preceding paragraph anyone caring to know will see by the long list of purposes for which this is to be expended the necessity for the provision. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### ERECTION OF BUILDINGS FOR LEGATION TO CHINA.

For the erection of necessary buildings for legation premises at Pekin, China, \$60,000.

Mr. HITT. That item, Mr. Chairman, is new. An appropriation of \$40,000 made last year for the purchase of ground is not repeated here. This is a provision for building a legation, made necessary by the recent disturbance in China. It was expected that we would buy the ground on which our old legation building stood, but so great a price was asked that it could not be obtained, and we have purchased other ground, which is believed to be more advantageous. This sum, it is said, will be sufficient for the erection of the building.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### INTERNATIONAL BUREAU OF WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

Contribution to the maintenance of the International Bureau of Weights and Measures for the year ending June 30, 1902, in conformity with the terms of the convention of May 24, 1875, the same, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to be paid, under the direction of the Secretary of State, to said Bureau, on its certificate of apportionment, \$2,270.

Mr. HEMENWAY. I move to strike out the last word, in order to call attention to a probable mistake on line 4, page 10. I think you ought to strike out "two" and insert "three."

Mr. HITT. The gentleman is correct. I move to strike out "two" and insert "three."



The Clerk read as follows:

On page 10, line 4, strike out the word "two" and insert the word "three," so that it will read "1903."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

INTERNATIONAL BUREAU FOR PUBLICATION OF CUSTOMS TARIFFS.

To meet the share of the United States in the annual expense for the year ending March 31, 1902, of sustaining the International Bureau at Brussels for the translation and publication of customs tariffs, \$1,318.76; this appropriation to be available on April 1, 1902, pursuant to convention proclaimed December 17, 1890.

Mr. HITT. I move to strike out the word "two," in line 14, and insert the word "three."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

INTERNATIONAL (WATER) BOUNDARY COMMISSION, UNITED STATES AND MEXICO.

To enable the Commission to continue its work under the treaties of 1884 and 1889, \$17,400.

Mr. HEMENWAY. I move to strike out the last word, in order that I may ask when the duties of this Commission will cease?

Mr. HITT. This work is continuous. It is pursuant to a convention between the nations, to which it is intended that copies of new tariffs, as made from time to time, shall be sent for translation and publication, and they are then communicated to the different countries.

Mr. HEMENWAY. I think the gentleman misunderstands my question. It is the last item, "International Boundary Commission."

Mr. HITT. That is the boundary survey to ascertain the boundary between the United States and Mexico, which is a work that has been prosecuted for a series of years. The Commission referred to is composed of a body of officers, a part of them from our Engineer Corps on the side of the United States, and a body of officers on the side of Mexico. It is a long, apparently endless work; but it is approaching completion, and we have provided this time an appropriation of \$2,600 less than last year, and we hope that it will be done very soon.

There is a series of volumes, I will state to the gentleman if he is interested in the subject and desires to see them, showing the progress of the work and the difficulty of determining and fixing the path of the Rio Grande. Gentlemen from Texas are familiar with the shifting pathway of the river, and know that it is the most uncertain stream in America. Sometimes part of the United States is found to be over in Mexico, and again, by another change, part of Mexico is in the United States, if you follow the course of the river as it runs in its changes. This has produced a vast amount of trouble in our customs service and in other ways, and this work is to settle and determine in some permanent way the boundary of the United States.

The Clerk read as follows:

To meet the share of the United States in the expenses of the special bureau created by article 82 of the general act concluded at Brussels July 2, 1890, for the repression of the African slave trade and the restriction of the importation into and sale in a certain defined zone of the African continent of firearms, ammunition, and spirituous liquors, for the year 1903, \$100.

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee where the African slave trade exists and between what countries.

Mr. HITT. There is a slave trade existing in central and eastern Africa. There was a convention or conference held at Brussels six or seven years ago, and our country adhered to it. It is a small cost. It is a slave traffic that is considerable and produces great horrors. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania is interested in the subject I will say that there was an admirable report made to this House by John H. Andrew, of Massachusetts, from the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. OLMSTED. I have no objection to the appropriation; I simply asked for information. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my formal amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amsterdam, Netherlands, consul, Schedule B, class 5, \$2,000.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I notice that the salary of the consul at Amsterdam is raised \$500. The office receives something like \$7,500 official fees, and I want to ask if the consul receives any fees in addition?

Mr. HITT. That official receives \$1,100 of unofficial fees besides the salary. There is a considerable allowance for clerk hire, but if the gentleman will notice the official fees which go to the Government, and not to the consul, he will see that it is one of the large business offices in Europe. The amount of business is so great that it was deemed proper to make that increase. It is a strong case, an exceptional case, though it is subject to a point of order if the gentleman chooses to make it.

Mr. HEMENWAY. I do not wish to make the point of order, and I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Budapest, Austria-Hungary, consul, Schedule B, class 6, \$1,500.

Mr. HITT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Budapest has been an office paid by fees. The fees amounted to \$1,461. It was thought much better to have it fixed by salary for various reasons than by fees, and we have made it a salary of \$1,500. This is a new salaried office.

The Clerk read as follows:

Cape Town, Africa, consul-general, Schedule B, \$3,000.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do not think there has been any intention to criticize the gentlemen of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, although several gentlemen have brought this question into the debate. I can not quite agree with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] nor the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK]. Those who have traveled in foreign countries will fully agree with me that the consular service of the United States is not what some of us say it is, and we ought to have reasonable revision of this important Government department. But, Mr. Chairman, my reason for especially rising in connection with this question is that I want to put these facts before the House. The consul-general at Cape Town is occupying a most important post. To-day that trade is increasing with enormous strides, and when the war in South Africa is over that gentleman will have very arduous duties to perform. It is a fact that the last consul-general, an able, fine man, Colonel Stowe, resigned because he was not paid a salary commensurate with his duties and one upon which he could afford to live decently, which can be confirmed by the State Department.

A gentleman by the name of Bingham was appointed to the position, and that gentleman is now in Cape Town. I have received letters from him within a recent date, in which he also says he can not live on the salary now paid. He has to do a great deal of work, and house rent and living expenses are very high, and a \$3,000 salary is inadequate for him to live upon.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the chairman of the committee consider this question. I shall also ask the consent of the House to continue my remarks in the RECORD, as I hope to give our friend from Missouri, notwithstanding his witty speech, some views on this subject which may be of value to the committee.

I ask, Mr. Chairman, to strike out the words "three thousand" and insert the words "forty-five hundred" as the salary of the consul-general at Cape Town. He only receives \$600 for clerk hire, and he wrote me the other day that he could not get a clerk at any such price. I know that is correct and that he can not obtain a clerk and stenographer combined that will do the duties properly for less than \$1,200. He would probably be willing to stay there if he could get a reasonable increase in his compensation. He wrote me in a letter, which I showed to the State Department, that he had spent since he left the United States, seven or eight months ago, over \$5,000 for himself and family, or over \$2,000 in excess of what he receives. I hope the chairman of the committee and the House will agree to my amendment.

Mr. HITT. The conditions are such that I am compelled to object. I recognize and the committee know the truth of the greater part of what the gentleman has stated. The \$3,000 salary at Cape Town is very attractive to applicants who want an office, and many applications are made for that office and have been for twenty years, and the men appointed are disillusioned by finding that it is a very expensive post.

The former incumbent, a most efficient man who, resigned, Mr. Stowe, has stated the facts truly. The consul there gets a greater amount than the gentleman from New York has stated. There are some notarial fees which go to him, and he gets \$304 as his one-half of the fees of the agents. We have also given him \$600 for clerk hire. If we had gone on to raise the salary of one \$3,000 post to \$3,500 like this, there would have been 50 gentlemen on the floor who would have insisted on equality and fair treatment, and that other consuls should be raised a like amount. The gentleman can see that if the committee allowed one amendment to go in there would be a dozen others.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, I recognize the truth of the remark by the chairman of the committee, and I withdraw my proposed amendment. I ask, however, Mr. Chairman, consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

Dawson City, Northwest Territory, consul, Schedule B, class 3, \$3,500.

Mr. HITT. I move to amend the paragraph just read by striking out, after the word "class," the word "three" and inserting "two;" so as to read "class 2."

The amendment was agreed to.



Mr. HEMENWAY. I move to amend by striking out the last word. I notice that this salary has been increased \$500. Does this officer get any fees in addition to his salary?

Mr. HITT. Yes, sir; enormous fees, as they seem to me. The unofficial fees going into his own pocket last year were \$3,925. The year before they were still higher, and his salary, which has been \$3,000, we have increased to \$3,500. In addition to that, we allow him a slight increase of clerk hire.

Mr. HEMENWAY. What reason is there why this officer should have this very large compensation?

Mr. HITT. That question was asked by the committee; and it was most aboundingly answered that this consul could not get a clerk for \$1,000 a year, nor could he keep one very long for more than that amount. The prices of living there are said to be prodigiously high. There is no other point in the world, as facts given to us seem to show, where the cost of lodging, food of mere existence from day to day, is so high as in Dawson City. To get one's meals at a restaurant costs more than board with a suite of rooms at the finest hotel in this part of the country.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Does the chairman of the committee think that this salary ought to be increased \$500 in addition to the fees which this officer receives?

Mr. HITT. I contested that point at the Department. We discussed this question in committee, because the compensation seemed too high, especially in view of another fact which I will candidly state, that this officer is not at this place all the year. But it appeared that the expenses of living there go outside of all scales that we have to measure things by. It is a mining camp, where all articles necessary for subsistence have to be imported from a distance at a great cost, and are poor and bad when they get there.

The CHAIRMAN. As the Chair understands, the pro forma amendment of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HEMENWAY] is withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ensenada, Mexico, consul, Schedule C, class 7, \$1,500.

Mr. HITT. I move to amend the paragraph just read by striking out "C" and inserting "B," and by striking out "seven" and inserting "six," so as to read "Schedule B, class 6."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HITT. I move to amend by striking out the last word. In this case we have raised the salary from \$1,000 to \$1,500. The business in Government fees has amounted to \$654 and in unofficial fees to about \$50.

I speak of this in order to show the spirit of the committee—their desire to do what appeared to be necessary. This is a small town and the business is small, but it is increasing very rapidly with the rush of American trade into northern Mexico. It has recently doubled and trebled. Undoubtedly, although it does not show in the invoices, there will be a larger business there.

We could not get a man of the proper capacity to live there in the mountains of Mexico on a salary of \$1,000 a year. In order to get an officer to stay there and be of some use we increased the salary \$500, although on the face of the matter this might seem to be unfair and partial treatment. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Freiburg, Germany, consul, Schedule B, class 5, \$2,000.

Mr. HEMENWAY. I observe at this place the salary has been increased. I would like to know some reason for this.

Mr. HITT. There is a large business at Freiburg.

Mr. HEMENWAY. How about the fees?

Mr. HITT. The official fees are large. The invoices cover quantities of velvets, woolen goods, etc., and in a single invoice may amount to \$5,000. The official fees last year were \$3,336.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Now, then, I understand the consul there gets one-half of that?

Mr. HITT. He gets nothing of that. That all goes to the Government.

Mr. HEMENWAY. What does he get in addition?

Mr. HITT. He gets the salary directly and then the unofficial fees, and last year all the unofficial fees or notarial fees in that consulate amounted to but \$444. That was so plain a case of underpay that we could not afford to let it pass, and so we increased it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Lucerne, Switzerland, consul, Schedule B, class 5, \$2,000.

Mr. HITT. I will say that that is a new consulate established by the committee in place of Aarau, which was a consulate and is now reduced to a consular agency. Lucerne is a city of much more importance politically and a suitable place for a consulate. So we made it a consulate instead of an agency and the other we made an agency instead of a consulate.

The Clerk read as follows:

Lyon, France, consul, Schedule B, class 4, \$2,500.

Mr. HITT. I move to amend, in line 13, page 23, by inserting the letter "s" after the word "Lyon," so that it will be "Lyons."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Marseille, France, consul, Schedule B, class 4, \$2,500.

Mr. HITT. I will ask consent to go back to page 22, line 21, and change a letter in the word "Leipzig." I wish to make it a "c" instead of a "g."

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the correction will be made.

Mr. HITT. On page 24, the paragraph just read, I move to insert after the word "Marseille" the letter "s," making it read "Marseilles."

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the correction will be made.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ottawa, Ontario, consul-general, Schedule B, \$3,500.

Mr. HITT. On page 26, in line 15, I move to amend by striking out the word "three" and in line 16 strike out the word "three" and the words "five hundred" and insert "four," so that it will read: "Ottawa, Ontario, consul-general, Schedule D, \$4,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HITT. I will ask consent to correct the motion I made a moment ago as to the word "Leipzig." I want to have that word corrected so that it will be spelled "Leipsic."

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the correction will be made.

The Clerk read as follows:

Para, Brazil, consul, Schedule B, class 5, \$2,500.

Mr. HITT. In line 21, page 26, I move to amend by striking out the word "five" and inserting the word "four," so that it will read "class four."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Patras, Greece, consul, Schedule C, class 6, \$1,500.

Mr. HITT. In line 1, at the top of page 27, I move to amend by striking out the letter "C" and inserting the letter "B."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HEMENWAY. I move to strike out the last word. I notice an increase in the salary there of \$500 and the total fees received are only \$467. Why is that?

Mr. HITT. Patras is a considerable port and the invoices do not always show the volume of business. The invoices of Paris are in these little articles of toilet, so that there are a great number of invoices, each one bringing a fee of \$2.50 for a small amount of value, but in the export tea trade from China a single invoice may cover many thousands of dollars' worth of tea. This is the chief port of Greece. The fruit and currant traffic is considerable.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Has it increased in the last year?

Mr. HITT. It is increasing all the time, but it run down during their war.

Mr. HEMENWAY. As to the next item there, the same matter, there is an increase there from \$2,500 to \$3,000 where the fees show only \$926. The item has been read.

Mr. HITT. Yes; Pernambuco is a coffee and sugar port. It is an unhealthy place, and unattractive, but important. One of the members of the committee who has been in Brazil agreed so strongly with the Department in recommending it, that we thought it was necessary to increase it in order to always secure a competent man in the place.

Mr. HEMENWAY. There has been no resignation?

Mr. HITT. There has not, but now and then deaths at those hot ports.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn, and the Clerk read as follows:

Port Limon, Costa Rica, consul, Schedule B, class 6, \$1,500.

Mr. HITT. I move to strike out the last word. Port Limon is a new consulate, and was established by the committee, not in the spirit of making offices, but for efficiency and to have a salaried consul. It is now paid by fees, and last year the fees that were paid, which went to the consul and to the consular agent, were \$3,884. We have put him on a salary of \$1,500, and then he gets the unofficial fees, which are not large.

The Clerk read as follows:

Port Sarnia, Ontario, consul, Schedule B, class 6, \$1,500.

Mr. HITT. Mr. Chairman, there is an omission that was made in the reporting of the bill. The subcommittee had agreed on it. Port Sarnia should be \$2,000, and I move that amendment. The gentleman who had charge of that was absent from the committee on the day it was passed on, and he has called attention to it since. I will make that motion.

The Clerk read the amendment, as follows:

In lines 13 and 14 strike out the words "one thousand five hundred" and insert the words "two thousand."



The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HITT. I also move to strike out the word "six," in line 13, and insert the word "five" instead.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Port Stanley, Falkland Islands, consul, Schedule B, class 6, \$2,000.

Mr. HITT. In line 16 of page 27 I move to strike out the word "six" and insert the word "five."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Pretoria, South African Republic, consul, Schedule B, class 5, \$3,000.

Mr. HITT. On page 27 I wish to amend, at line 22, by striking out the word "five" and inserting the word "three."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Quebec, Quebec, consul, Schedule B, class 4, \$3,000.

Mr. HITT. Mr. Chairman, in line 5, page 28, the word "four" should be "three," so that it will read "class 3."

The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 28, in line 5, strike out "four" and insert "three," so that it will read "class 3."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Rheims, France, consul, Schedule B, class 5, \$2,000.

Mr. HITT. Mr. Chairman, after line 10, I move to insert the words "Riga, Russia, consul, Schedule C, class 7, \$750."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

After line 10, insert "Riga, Russia, consul, Schedule C, class 7, \$750."

Mr. HITT. It is due to the House that I should explain this amendment. This is the lowest salary given to a consul, so far as I know. The State Department asked this. It was not submitted formally to the committee, but the statement was made by the Assistant Secretary that the officer there is a large shipping merchant who does a great deal of business for Americans and American interests.

We can not get an American to go out there at any such compensation, and the State Department asks that this resident of the town of Riga be given this small salary. There seems to be considerable business there, but he has to pay the clerk hire and the office rent.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Stanbridge, Canada, consul, Schedule B, \$1,000.

Mr. HITT. Mr. Chairman, that is a new salaried office. The fees there are not much. The whole compensation of the consul is only a little over \$500. We have made the salary \$1,000. None of us thought we could make it any less in decency. The duties are of an important character, but some of them have nothing to do with commerce. That is a runaway for the Chinese who are brought across the border by a system of bribery and smuggling. This officer has been efficient there. We make the new salaried office and fix the salary at \$1,000.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sydney, New South Wales, consul, Schedule B, class 5, \$2,000.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I should like to ask the gentleman from Illinois and the members of this House to increase the salary of the consul at Sydney, New South Wales. That is a city of 400,000 people, and under the new federation of the colonies it will be the most important point in the South Seas. I have lived there myself, and know the place well, and I do not see how a man can possibly live there on that salary. I move to strike out \$2,000 and insert \$3,000.

Mr. HITT. Is that Sydney, Nova Scotia?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; Sydney, New South Wales.

Mr. HITT. The salary is \$2,000 at present.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Two thousand dollars at present, in a city of 400,000 people, with at least \$10,000,000 of exports from this country going in there every year. I know the consuls who have lived there for the last twenty years. I have lived there myself. I will not say how much I have had to spend there, but I say that no man can represent this country properly on that salary, even with what little fees he may have. It is a disgrace to this country to ask him to do it.

Mr. HITT. I agree with the gentleman. I know the port very well and I know the consul. He has made a good official.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not know who the consul is at present, except by name.

Mr. HITT. I do, and he is a good officer. But I have no right as an individual member to assent to an amendment of this kind.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I will ask to have the amendment submitted to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 31, line 20, strike out "two" and insert "three;" so that it will read "\$3,000."

Mr. HITT. I am compelled, Mr. Chairman, to make the point of order against that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

Three Rivers, Canada, consul, Schedule B, class 5, \$2,000.

Mr. HITT. Mr. Chairman, at Three Rivers, Canada, there is an increase. On account of the great rapidity in the increase of business we have raised it from \$1,500 to \$2,000. The fees will show that there is a large increase there, based on increase of American population who have bought these lands, and the trade in timber and in agricultural implements is very large.

The Clerk read as follows:

Total, \$581,500.

Mr. HITT. I offer the following amendment:

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 19, page 31, strike out the word "one" and insert the word "two," and by striking out the word "five" and inserting the word "seven," and by adding after the word "hundred" "and fifty;" so that it will read \$582,750.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Leipzig, Germany, \$800.

Mr. HITT. Mr. Chairman, on line 2 make the same change, from "Leipzig" to "Leipsic."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Lyon, France, \$1,200.

Mr. HITT. I move to amend, in line 5, after the word "Lyon," by inserting the letter "s," so as to read "Lyons."

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the correction will be made.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Marseille, France, \$1,200.

Mr. HITT. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by inserting "s" after the word "Marseille."

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the amendment will be agreed to.

There was no objection.

The Clerk resumed and concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. FEELY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HITT. Mr. Chairman, that concludes the consideration of the bill in the committee. I now move that the committee rise and report the bill to the House with a favorable recommendation of the bill and amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CURRIS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 11471) making appropriations for the diplomatic and consular service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and had directed him to report the same back with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment; if not, the Chair will submit them in gross to the House.

The question was taken on the amendments in gross, and they were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. HITT, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

HOUSE BILL AND SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate concurrent resolution and House bill (with Senate amendments) of the following title were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees as indicated below:

Senate concurrent resolution 26:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed the number of copies hereafter stated of tables of an annotated index to the Congressional series of the United States public documents, prepared under the supervision of the Superintendent of Documents, 5,000 copies; 1,000 copies for the use of the Senate, 3,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives, and 1,000 copies for the Superintendent of Documents—to the Committee on Printing.

H. R. 5833. An act temporarily to provide revenue for the



Philippine Islands, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. HITT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn. The motion was agreed to.

And accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Interior submitting an estimate of appropriations for establishment of the boundary line between Montana and Idaho—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a petition of yeomen and others in the Navy, asking for the passage of the bills (H. R. 7486, S. 1883) relating to clerical services in the Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Ira J. Partlow, administrator of estate of Lydia Hoff and Hannah Updike against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. TATE, from the Committee on Printing, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10161) providing for the distribution of Government publications to colleges, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 591); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. JONES of Washington, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4549) authorizing the issuance of a patent to the county of Clallam, State of Washington, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 593); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MONDELL, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11053) providing for the issuance of patent to the town site of Basin, to the municipal authorities thereof, for the use and benefit of said town, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 594); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DAVEY of Louisiana, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10072) for the establishment of a light-house at the mouth of Oyster Bayou, near the Louisiana coast, in the Gulf of Mexico, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 595); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LOUD, from the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11728) to classify the rural free-delivery service and fix the compensation to employees thereof, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 597); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. FLETCHER, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4607) to provide for the construction of a bridge and approaches thereto across the Missouri River at or near South Omaha, Nebr., reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 598); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. SLAYDEN, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1592) for the relief of F. M. Vowells, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 592); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DAYTON, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1258) to remove the charge of desertion from the naval record of John Glass, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 596); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, MEMORIALS, AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RODEY: A bill (H. R. 11800) to authorize the Navajo Indians to lease mineral lands on a royalty basis—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 11801) amending section 4 of an act to provide revenue for the Government and to encourage the industries of the United States, approved July 24, 1897—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLYNN: A bill (H. R. 11802) to enable the people of Oklahoma to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. FLOOD: A bill (H. R. 11803) for the purchase, for a national park, of the tract of land upon which the Natural Bridge of Virginia is situated—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROBERTS: A bill (H. R. 11804) to diminish the number of appraisers of merchandise at the ports of Philadelphia and Boston—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LITTLEFIELD: A bill (H. R. 11805) to provide for the construction of a light-house and fog signal at Outer Diamond Shoal, on the coast of North Carolina, at Cape Hatteras—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WARNER: A bill (H. R. 11806) to amend the act of August 27, 1888, to provide aid to State or Territorial Homes for the support of disabled soldiers and sailors of the United States so as to provide aid to such Homes for the support of wives, widows, and mothers of such soldiers and sailors—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 11807) to open for settlement 25,000 acres of land in the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Indian reservations, in Oklahoma Territory—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 11808) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the adjudication and payment of claims arising from Indian depredations," approved March 3, 1891—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. LOUD: A bill (H. R. 11839) authorizing the Secretary of War to loan certain tents for use at Knights of Pythias encampment, to be held at San Francisco, Cal.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JONES of Washington: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 158) providing for a modification in the adopted project for the improvement of Everett Harbor, Washington—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey: A resolution (H. Res. 144) authorizing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to pay to the widow of Charles T. Parker, late printing clerk of said House of Representatives, a sum equal to six months' salary, and funeral expenses, not exceeding \$250, the same to be immediately available—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: Memorial of the legislature of Minnesota, respecting the 5 per cent or minimum price of public lands appropriated for military compensation—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. BELL: A bill (H. R. 11809) for the relief of Oscar Rankin—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11810) for the relief of Wilbert Bowen, of Cripple Creek, Colo.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BURK of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 11811) to correct the military record of Patrick Harrington—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 11812) granting an increase of pension to Martin Boice—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 11813) granting an increase of pension to Richard Trist—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CROWLEY: A bill (H. R. 11814) granting an increase of pension to Peter Kaufman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11815) to correct record of Thomas Riley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.



Also, a bill (H. R. 11816) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth C. Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11817) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Robinson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11818) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Anderson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOUGLAS: A bill (H. R. 11819) granting an increase of pension to John L. Grener—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FLOOD: A bill (H. R. 11820) for the relief of the estate of Robert J. Hope, deceased, of Staunton, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GOOCH: A bill (H. R. 11821) for the relief of Nina W. Halsey, widow of Capt. Irving Halsey, of Company C, Fifth Ohio Cavalry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOPKINS: A bill (H. R. 11822) granting an increase of pension to John M. Bigger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11823) to correct the military record of Benjamin F. Herrington, late a private of Company H, Fourth Michigan Infantry, and a corporal of Company D, Eleventh Michigan Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JACKSON of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 11824) granting a pension to George W. James—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KERN: A bill (H. R. 11825) for the relief of James E. Johnson—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MAHONEY: A bill (H. R. 11826) removing the charges against the record of Samuel Warren—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. McCALL: A bill (H. R. 11827) granting a pension to Antoinette I. Sawyer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MICKEY: A bill (H. R. 11828) to remove charge of desertion from military record of Alonzo McKenzie—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NORTON: A bill (H. R. 11829) granting a pension to Frederick W. Spier—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POWERS of Maine: A bill (H. R. 11830) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Henry G. McDougall—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PUGSLEY: A bill (H. R. 11831) granting an increase of pension to John W. Acker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAY of New York: A bill (H. R. 11832) granting an increase of pension to Caroline Bingham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCHIRM: A bill (H. R. 11833) granting an increase of pension to Albanis L. Anderson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11834) granting an increase of pension to Austin Blackwell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SELBY: A bill (H. R. 11835) granting an increase of pension to Chamberlain Belk—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11836) granting a pension to John A. Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11837) granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah Cokely—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 11838) to allot 160 acres of land to Bianco L. Bell, of Clay County, Tex., out of the Comanche, Kiowa, and Apache reservations, in Oklahoma—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CORLISS: A bill (H. R. 11840) to correct the military record of Nelson E. Freer—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SOUTHARD: A bill (H. R. 11841) granting an increase of pension to Peter Whitmore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Petitions of Belknap Post, No. 515, Keokuk, Iowa; Liberal Post, No. 515, Liberal, Mo.; E. D. Edward Post, No. 22, Vicksburg, Miss., and G. W. Hughs Post, No. 298, Nashville, Ohio, Grand Army of the Republic, for investigation of the administration of the Bureau of Pensions—to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ADAMSON: Resolutions of Order of Railway Conductors, Chattanooga Division, and Carpenters and Joiners' Union No. 313, both of Columbus, Ga., favoring an educational test in the restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. ACHESON: Petition of Mine Workers' Union No. 1115, of Pricedale, Pa., in favor of the exclusion of Chinese laborers—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: Petitions of D. O. Trainor and other clerks of Buffalo, N. Y., post-office, for the classification of sala-

ries of clerks in first and second class post-offices—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolutions of Coopers' Union No. 33, Buffalo, N. Y., and Lake Seamen's Union, Tonawanda, N. Y., for an educational test in the restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolutions of Coopers' Union No. 33, and Typographical Union No. 9, of Buffalo, N. Y., in favor of the Chinese-exclusion act—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolution of Robert Orr Post, No. 553, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of New York, for the building of war vessels in the United States navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of Legislative Board of Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen of Albany, N. Y., favoring the passage of the Hoar-Grosvenor anti-injunction bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BELL: Resolution of Order of Railway Conductors, Grand Junction, Colo., for an amendment to the immigration laws—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BENTON: Resolution of Cigar Makers' Union No. 322, of Joplin, Mo., for an amendment to the immigration laws—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolution of Post No. 141, Grand Army of the Republic, of Marionville, Mo., favoring the construction of naval vessels at the Government navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN: Resolutions of the La Crosse Board of Trade, in opposition to the bill relating to the affairs of the Chippewas of Minnesota, known as the Morris bill—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, resolutions of the Retail Clerks' International Protective Association, of Marinette, Wis., favoring the exclusion of the Chinese—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BULL: Resolutions adopted at the Thirty-fifth Annual Encampment, District of Rhode Island, Grand Army of the Republic, in favor of a service pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolutions of Journeymen Barbers' Union No. 224, of Providence, R. I., and of Journeymen Plumbers' Union No. 28, of Providence, R. I., in favor of the Chinese-exclusion act—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BURKETT: Resolution of Mullegan Post, No. 209, Grand Army of the Republic, of Western, Nebr., favoring the construction of war vessels in Government navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania: Petition of Boiler Makers' Union No. 17, Chester, Pa., favoring the exclusion of Chinese—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CALDERHEAD: Petition of John Brown Post, No. 44, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Kansas, for investigation of the administration of the Bureau of Pensions—to the Committee on Rules.

Also, resolution of board of supervisors of Coconino County, Ariz., requesting Congress to fix a tax valuation on the property of the Santa Fe Railway Company throughout Arizona—to the Committee on Pacific Railroads.

Also, papers of I. A. Fort, in support of greater homesteads—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CANNON: Petition of Central Trades and Labor Council of Joliet, Ill., for the enactment of an eight-hour law and mandatory classification for clerks in first and second class post-offices—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolutions adopted by Iron Molders' Union No. 221, of Joliet, Ill., favoring more strict immigration laws—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolution of Central Trades and Labor Council, and Union No. 33, and Union Label League No. 39, all of Joliet, Ill., favoring the exclusion of Chinese laborers from the United States and insular possessions—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CAPRON: Resolutions of Journeymen Barbers' Union No. 224 and of Journeymen Plumbers' Union No. 28, of Providence, R. I., in favor of the Chinese-exclusion act—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of Cigar Makers' Union No. 94, of Pawtucket, R. I., for the restriction of illiterate immigrants—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions adopted at the Thirty-fifth Annual Encampment, District of Rhode Island, Grand Army of the Republic, in favor of a service pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolutions of Journeymen Plumbers' Union No. 28, of Providence, R. I., advocating the construction of war vessels in the Government navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of citizens of Newport, R. I., in favor of the reduction of Congressional representation in those States wherein the right of suffrage is abridged by constitutional enactment—to the Committee on the Census.



Also, petition of Rev. William Sheafe Chase, of Woonsocket, R. I., against the regulation of vice in the insular possessions—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CASSINGHAM: Petition of citizens of Holmes County, Ohio, in favor of the reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion act—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CONNELL: Resolutions of Post No. 218, Grand Army of the Republic, of Moscow, Pa., favoring the building of naval vessels in the Government navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, resolution of the Merchants' Exchange of San Francisco, Cal., for the admission of the mercantile class of Chinese—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the board of supervisors of Mohave County, Ariz., in opposition to legislation exempting the Santa Fe Railway Company from taxation in Arizona Territory—to the Committee on Pacific Railroads.

Also, resolution of the Engineers' Club of Philadelphia, Pa., in favor of the Appalachian National Park Association—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, resolutions of Brewery Workers' Union No. 232, of Scranton, and Mine Workers' Union No. 844, of Carbondale, Pa., in favor of the reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion act—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of Order of Railway Conductors, Pennsylvania Division, No. 156, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Division No. 403, and Brewery Workers' Union No. 232, of Scranton, Pa., favoring a further restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: Petition of Boot and Shoe Workers' Union No. 284, of Janesville, Wis., favoring exclusion of Chinese laborers—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CROWLEY: Papers to accompany House bill 11816, granting a pension to Elizabeth C. Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 11814, granting a pension to Peter Kaufman—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 11815, to correct record of Thomas Riley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 11817, granting an increase of pension to Joseph Robinson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DALZELL: Petition of sundry citizens of Pittsburg, Pa., for amendment of Constitution to prohibit and punish polygamy and defining legal marriage—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolutions of Tile Layers' Union of Pittsburg, Pa., favoring the continuation of the exclusion law against Chinese laborers—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DOVENER: Petition of Mrs. S. O. Paull and 24 other citizens of Wellsburg, W. Va., for amendment to the National Constitution relating to polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DRAPER: Petition of the board of supervisors of Coconino County, Ariz., in opposition to legislation exempting the Santa Fe Railway Company from taxation in Arizona Territory—to the Committee on Pacific Railroads.

By Mr. ESCH: Resolutions of Marine Council of the Port of Milwaukee, Wis., protesting against the passage of House bill 9685—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, resolution of Marine Council of Milwaukee, Wis., to exclude Chinese laborers—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolution of Marine Council of Milwaukee, Wis., for the passage of laws which will prevent the immigration of persons who can not read—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FLOOD: Paper to accompany House bill for the relief of Robert Hope—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FOSS: Resolutions of Carpenters and Joiners' Unions Nos. 18 and 181, of Chicago, Ill., favoring an educational test in the restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GILBERT: Petition of the National American Woman Suffrage Association, in relation to the right of suffrage for women—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Lincoln County, Ky., requesting legislation prohibiting Government license to liquor dealers in localities where the sale of liquor is prohibited by State laws—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. GOOCH: Resolution of Blue Grass Union No. 1; Journeymen Horseshoers' Union No. 111, and Union No. 5, Federation of Labor, of Newport and Covington, Ky., and Clothing Cutters and Trimmers' Union No. 100, of Cincinnati, Ohio, favoring the exclusion of Chinese—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania: Resolution of Iron Molders'

Union No. 370, of Reading, Pa., asking the passage of a Chinese-exclusion law of permanent duration—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HAMILTON: Resolution of Henry M. Liddle Post, No. 131, and David Oaks Post, No. 135, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Michigan, favoring the construction of war vessels in Government navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of Sterling Post, No. 74, of Weyland, and L. C. Woodman Post, No. 196, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Michigan, for investigation of the administration of the Bureau of Pensions—to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HEMENWAY: Resolution of the Indiana State Board of Commerce, for the passage of amendments to strengthen interstate-commerce act—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolutions of Potters' Union No. 5, of Evansville, and Mine Workers' Union No. 1244, of Boonville, Ind., favoring the Chinese-exclusion act—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of Cigar Makers' Union No. 54 and Potters' Union No. 5, of Evansville, Ind., in regard to immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HILDEBRANT: Petition of residents of the Sixth Congressional district of Ohio, asking for an amendment to the Constitution defining legal marriage—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL: Resolutions of Cigar Makers' Union No. 139, of Long Hill, Conn., and Electrical Workers' Union No. 146, of Bridgeport, Conn., in favor of the reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion act—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HITT: Resolution of Carpenters' Union No. 719, of Freeport, Ill., for the passage of laws which will prevent the immigration of persons who can not read—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HOPKINS: Paper to accompany House bill 11822, granting a pension to John M. Bigger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOWELL: Protest of W. E. Honeyman, of Plainfield, N. J., against regulation of vice by Manila board of health—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JACK: Resolutions of United Mine Workers' Unions Nos. 79 and 761, of Webster, Pa., in favor of the reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion act—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of Marchand Post, No. 190, of Irwin, Pa., concerning the construction of Government vessels in navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. JACKSON of Kansas: Resolution of Atchison (Kans.) city council, favoring the construction of the Pacific cable by private enterprise—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 3746, for the relief of Richard L. Sturges—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOY: Petition of Division No. 48, Locomotive Engineers, of St. Louis, Mo., favoring an educational test for immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. KNAPP: Resolutions of Plumbers' Union No. 117, American Federation of Labor, of Watertown, N. Y., advocating the building of war vessels in the navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. KNOX: Resolution of Brotherhood of Stationary Firemen of Lowell, Mass., favoring the Chinese-exclusion act—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of Team Drivers' Union No. 262, Carpenters and Joiners' Union No. 49, and Cigar Makers' Union No. 255, all of Lowell, Mass., relative to admission of immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LACEY: Resolutions of Carpenters' Unions Nos. 166 and 554, of Rock Island, Ill., protesting against treatment of union-labor employees at the United States arsenal at Rock Island, Ill.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolutions of the St. Paul Chamber of Commerce, favoring storage reservoirs for the reclamation of arid lands—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. LANHAM: Resolution of W. H. Reilly Division, No. 427, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen, of Yoakum, Tex., in support of Senate bill 1118 and House bill 1060, limiting the meaning of the word "conspiracy," etc.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESTER: Petitions of Councils Nos. 2, 3, 8, and 16, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Savannah, Ga., advocating the reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion law—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LINDSAY: Resolution of International Association of Machinists No. 15, of New York City, favoring the construction of war vessels in Government navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LITTAUER: Petition of citizens of Ballston Spa, N. Y.,



asking for revision of the rural free-delivery laws—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. MAHONEY: Resolution of the Lake Seamen's Union of Chicago, Ill., in opposition to House bill 9685—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, resolution of Carpenters and Joiners' Union No. 451, of Chicago, Ill., favoring the repeal of the desert-land act, etc.—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MARSHALL: Petition of Appomattox Post, No. 24, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of North Dakota, for investigation of the administration of the Bureau of Pensions—to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition of H. S. Wiley and other citizens of Hillsboro, N. Dak., praying for the enactment of a law against polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN: Petition of citizens of the county of Fall River, S. Dak., against leasing of public lands—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, resolutions of McLean Post, No. 162; Letcher Post; General Crook Post, No. 153, Grand Army of the Republic, of White-wood, S. Dak., urging that the navy-yards be utilized for the construction of war vessels—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. McANDREWS: Petition of Carpenters and Joiners' Union No. 181, of Chicago, Ill., for an educational test in the restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. McDERMOTT: Petition of Coopers' Union No. 20, of Jersey City, N. J., favoring the Chinese-exclusion act—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of Typographical Union No. 94, of Jersey City, N. J., favoring an educational test in the restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. McCALL: Petition of Carpenters' Union No. 441, of Cambridge, Mass., in favor of restricting immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. McCLEARY: Resolution of James Clabough Post, Grand Army of the Republic, of Winnebago City, Minn., favoring the construction of war vessels in Government navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MICKEY: Petition of Tobacco Workers' Union No. 19, of Quincy, Ill., favoring the construction of naval vessels at the Government navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MIERS of Indiana: Papers to accompany House bill 2552, for the relief of Mahala C. Carter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MONDELL: Petition of ranchmen and stockmen of the county of Laramie, Wyo., in relation to the leasing of public lands and the homestead law—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts: Resolutions of Machinists' Union, American Federation of Labor, of Salem, Mass., favoring the building of war vessels in United States navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, resolutions of Carpenters and Joiners' Union of Danvers, Mass., favoring the restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MUTCHLER: Resolution of Agricultural Board of Pennsylvania, favoring House bill 8735, oleomargarine, and opposing irrigation of arid lands—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, resolutions of Order of Railroad Conductors of Mauch Chunk, Pa., praying for the further restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolutions of Carpenters and Joiners' Union of East Stroudsburg, Pa.; Robert Oldham Post, No. 527, Grand Army of the Republic, of South Bethlehem, Pa., and Iron Molders' Union of Lehigh and Westport, Pa., urging that the navy-yards be utilized for the construction of war vessels—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, resolutions of Typographical Union No. 258, Barbers' Union 277, of Easton, Pa.; United Mine Workers' Unions of Lansford and Carbon, Pa., in favor of the Chinese-exclusion act—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. NORTON: Statement and photograph to accompany House bill 10964, granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Beebe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolutions of J. W. Ash Post, No. 679, Kansas, Ohio; Roberts Post, No. 672, Poplar, Ohio, and Moses Martin Post, No. 649, Huron, Ohio, Grand Army of the Republic, and International Association of Machinists No. 344, Galion, Ohio, favoring the construction of naval vessels at the Government navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petitions of G. B. Smeltzer and 47 citizens of Marion, Ohio; Longshoremen's Union No. 170, Sandusky; Cigar Makers' Union No. 79, Sandusky; Machinists' Union No. 344, Galion; Iron Molders' Union No. 328, Crestline; Potters' Union No. 7, Tiffin; Buckeye Union, No. 228, Galion, and Job Pressmen's Union

No. 12, Dayton, all in the State of Ohio, advocating the reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion law—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. OTJEN: Resolutions of Lake Seamen's Union, Chicago, Ill., and Marine Council of the Port of Milwaukee, Wis., protesting against the passage of House bill 9685—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, resolution of Marine Council of Milwaukee, Wis.; Federated Trades Council, Coopers' Union No. 35, Cigar Makers' Union No. 25, and Eagle Lodge No. 1, all of Milwaukee, Wis., to exclude Chinese laborers—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolution of Marine Council of Milwaukee, Wis., and Order of Railway Conductors, Milwaukee Division No. 46, for the passage of laws which will prevent the immigration of persons who can not read—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. OVERSTREET: Resolution of the Topeka (Kans.) Commercial Club, condemning the proposed Bowersock land-grazing bill (H. R. 7212)—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, petition of Elkhart Chapter, Division 248, and Indianapolis Division No. 11, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, favoring bill (H. R. 9678) to limit the power of Federal courts in granting injunctions in trade disputes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PAYNE: Papers to accompany House bill 11343, granting a pension to Mary Louise Lowry—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. POWERS of Maine: Papers to accompany House bill 11830, relating to the correction of the military record of Henry G. McDougall—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PEARRE: Petition of George E. Anderson and 45 others, of Williamsport, Md., favoring the continuation of the exclusion law against Chinese laborers—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PRINCE: Petition of Alfred Bing Post, No. 492, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Illinois, for investigation of the administration of the Bureau of Pensions—to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PUGSLEY: Resolution of Ossining Division, New York, Order of Telegraphers, No. 99, for an educational test in the restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolution of Kitching Post, No. 60, of Yonkers, N. Y., Grand Army of the Republic, favoring the construction of naval vessels at Government navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, resolution of Lodge No. 15, Association of Machinists, New York City; Wood Carriers' Union, No. 9144, of Mamaroneck, N. Y., and Cigar Makers' Union No. 81, of Peekskill, N. Y., in favor of the exclusion of Chinese laborers—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana: Resolution of Central Labor Union, American Federation of Labor, of Fort Wayne, Ind., advocating extension of Chinese-exclusion act—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Advance Grange, of Fremont, Ind., against Government irrigation projects, and in favor of the McCleary bill—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, resolution of Order of Railway Conductors, No. 138, Garrett, Ind., for the restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. RYAN: Resolutions of Lake Seamen's Union, Tonawanda, N. Y., and Outside Freight Handlers' Union No. 242, Buffalo, N. Y., urging that the navy-yards be utilized for the construction of war vessels—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, resolutions of Lake Seamen's Union, Tonawanda, N. Y., and Stationary Firemen's Union No. 11, of Buffalo, N. Y., in favor of the exclusion of Chinese laborers—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of Tonawanda Branch, Lake Seamen's Union, of Tonawanda, N. Y., protesting against the passage of House bill 9685—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SCHIRM: Petitions of United Brotherhood Leather Union No. 88, of Baltimore, Md., and of certain residents of Baltimore, favoring Chinese exclusion—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SCOTT: Resolutions of the Industrial Council of Pittsburgh, Kans., favoring the continued exclusion of Chinese laborers from the United States—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SIBLEY: Petitions of International Association of Machinists, Journeymen Plumbers' Union No. 207, and Federal Labor Union No. 7150, all of Bradford, Pa., in favor of the reenactment of Chinese-exclusion act—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SELBY: Petition of Hesse Post, No. 203, of Winchester,



Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Illinois, for investigation of the administration of the Bureau of Pensions—to the Committee on Rules.

Also, resolution of Chiles Post, No. 278, of Palmyra, Ill., Grand Army of the Republic, favoring the construction of war vessels in the Government navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, resolution of the Chamber of Commerce of Quincy, Ill., favoring the creation of a department of commerce—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: Petition of Carpenters and Joiners' Union No. 717, of San Antonio, Tex., favoring a further restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SNOOK: Petition of Evans Post, No. 194, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Ohio, for investigation of the administration of the Bureau of Pensions—to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SOUTHARD: Resolution of Journeymen Tailors' Union of Toledo, Ohio, and Gas Well Workers' Union and citizens of North Baltimore, Ohio, favoring the passage of the Chinese-exclusion law—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolution of Manufacturers' Club of Cincinnati, Ohio, and Central Labor Union of Toledo, Ohio, favoring the bill to increase the efficiency and to change the name of the United States Marine-Hospital Service—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolution of Typographical Union No. 63; of Ford Post, No. 14, and Quiggle Post, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Ohio, urging that the navy-yards be utilized for the construction of war vessels—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, resolutions of various orders in Toledo, Ohio, for an educational test in the restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SPERRY: Resolution of directors of the Connecticut State prison, opposing legislation forbidding transportation of prison-made goods from one State to another—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. STEELE: Petition of Henry C. Coulter Post, No. 131, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Indiana, for investigation of the administration of the Bureau of Pensions—to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: Petition of citizens of Lindstrom, Minn., favoring the election of United States Senators by direct vote of the people—to the Committee on Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress.

Also, resolution of St. Paul Liquor Dealers' Union, urging the passage of House bills 178 and 179, proposing to reduce the tax on whisky—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Crookston, Minn., in favor of the establishment of a military post at Crookston, Minn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Machinists' Union No. 112, of St. Paul, Minn., advocating the building of war vessels in the navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, resolution of Cooks' Alliance No. 271, Division No. 40, Order of Railway Conductors, and Zenith Division, No. 249, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, favoring a further restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolution of German-American Central Bund, of St. Paul, Minn., against restrictive legislation on immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolutions of Cigar Makers' Union No. 98 and Waiters' Union No. 43, of St. Paul, Minn., advocating the reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion law—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: Resolution of Granite Cutters' National Union, of Milford, and Freight Handlers' Union, of Manchester, N. H., favoring the reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion act—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of Post No. 57, Columbia, N. H., Grand Army of the Republic; Old Homestead Lodge, No. 319, of Keene, N. H., urging that the navy-yards be utilized for the construction of war vessels—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, resolution of Columbia Council, Daughters of Liberty, Manchester, N. H., favoring reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion law, a more restrictive immigration law, fixing a severe penalty for attempt on the life of the President, etc., and a law to prohibit the landing and for the deportation of anarchists—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance unions of East Rochester, East Colbrook, Richmond, South Acworth, Newmarket, Concord, Franklin, Candia, Rumney, Seabrook, Newport, Alton, Claremont, and Contocook, N. H., for amendment of Constitution to prohibit and punish polygamy and defining legal marriage—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama: Petition of Brotherhood of Railway Carmen, Union No. 76, of Whistler, Ala., in favor of the exclusion of Chinese laborers—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TOMPKINS: Resolutions of Hollingsworth Division, No. 100, Order of Railway Conductors, Columbus, Ohio, favoring bill to limit the power of Federal courts in granting injunctions in trade disputes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution of Hollingsworth Division, No. 100, Order of Railway Conductors, Columbus, Ohio, favoring the reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion act—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WANGER: Resolutions of Colonel Croasdale Post, No. 256, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Pennsylvania, for the building of war vessels in the United States navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, resolution of Carpenters' Union No. 465, of Ardmore, Pa., and Cigar Makers' Union, No. 489, of Souderton, Pa., for the passage of laws which will prevent the immigration of persons who can not read—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WARNER: Resolution of Champaign (Ill.) Local Union of Carpenters and Joiners of America, favoring the passage of a law which will prevent the immigration of persons who can not read—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WARNOCK: Petition of S. C. Kitchen and other citizens of Delaware County, Ohio, for an amendment to the National Constitution defining legal marriage to be monogamic—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON: Resolution of Photo-engravers' Union No. 23, of New York City, and District Lodge No. 15, of International Association of Machinists, of New York, asking for reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion law—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WOODS: Petition of City Front Federation, of San Francisco, Cal., favoring House bill 9330, to exclude Chinese from competition with American workers—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of Vallejo Lodge, No. 148, Boiler Makers and Iron Ship Builders, condemning the action of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco on the Chinese—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolution of San Francisco (Cal.) Labor Council, advocating the building of war vessels in the navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, resolutions of Upholsterers' Union No. 63, of Stockton, Cal., and Pacific Coast Marine Firemen's Union, favoring the Chinese-exclusion act—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, February 26, 1902.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

Mr. FORAKER. Mr. President, on account of the McKinley memorial exercises, which are to be held in the Hall of the House of Representatives at 12 o'clock to-morrow, I move that when the Senate adjourns to-day the adjournment be until a quarter before 12 to-morrow.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BURROWS. Mr. President, the Committee on Privileges and Elections had a session this morning, and we are in the midst of the consideration of the order submitted to that committee. By direction of the committee, and hoping we may be able to reach an agreement, I am requested to make the motion that the Senate do now adjourn.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan moves that the Senate do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, February 27, 1902, at 11 o'clock and 45 minutes a. m.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, February 26, 1902.

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

### REPRINT OF A BILL.

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Speaker, I will ask first unanimous consent for a reprint of the bill (H. R. 11354) making appropriations for the service of the Post-Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, including the accompanying report, No. 550, as I understand it is exhausted.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent for the reprint of the House bill 11354, being the